DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 214 541 IR 010 128

TITLE User Surveys and Evaluation of Library Services. SPEC Kit #71.
INSTITUTION Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C. Office of Management Studies.
PUB DATE Feb 81
NOTE 116p.; Best available copy.
AVAILABLE FROM SPEC, Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Studies, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20036 ($7.50 ARL members; $15.00 to all others).

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Libraries; Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; Library Catalogs; Library Collections; *Library Services; *Library Surveys; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; *Research Libraries; *User Satisfaction (Information); *Use Studies

ABSTRACT

This set of materials assembled by the Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC) of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) contains seven examples of general use surveys and eight examples of user surveys on specific topics from a group of major research libraries. Among the items included are (1) a final report on a library user survey from the University of California at Riverside; (2) a user survey from the Elmer Holmes Bobst Library at New York University; (3) questionnaires on the adequacy of library service at Emory University; (4) library use surveys from Colorado State University, the University of Colorado, and the University of New Mexico; (5) an availability analysis report from the University of Arizona; and (6) an undergraduate library availability study from the University of Tennessee, a user assistance tally from the University of Georgia, a faculty questionnaire on branch and division libraries from the University of Colorado, a search services user and availability of citations questionnaire from Boston University, and the executive summary of a Cornell University user survey on the libraries' research support performance. (JL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

February 1981

OMS

Systems and Procedures Exchange Center

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED214541

User Surveys and Evaluation of Library Services

Kit 71

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Maxine K. Sitts

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR010128

The Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC) is operated by the Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Studies, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Telephone (202) 232-8656.

February 1981 #71

OMS

Systems and Procedures Exchange Center

ISSN-0160-3574

USER SURVEYS AND EVALUATION OF LIBRARY SERVICES

Academic and research libraries face many of the same difficulties in assessing their performance as other service organizations. They have a diverse clientele, both in terms of level of sophistication and area of interest. They must choose from an array of potential services which to provide and which of those to emphasize. Their financial base is restricted and will not expand simply by increasing the volume of services used. And they depend on the support of clientele for their continued existence. Given this situation, academic libraries have approached the assessment of their services in a variety of ways. Some have sought feedback from faculty library committees; some have initiated informal mechanisms such as suggestion boxes; some have assigned responsibility for liaison with academic departments to specific reference librarians or bibliographers. More formal approaches have included user surveys, materials availability and accessibility studies, facilities use studies, and studies of specialized services, such as interlibrary loan or library use instruction. This Kit/Flyer is primarily concerned with the more formal approaches.

Incentives for Assessing Library Services. Libraries have identified three general incentives for performing service assessments on either an ongoing or periodic basis. First is the need to avoid the natural tendency of many service organizations toward bureacratic behavior. Because there is no obvious, quantitative accountability for most service organizations, such as a profit and loss statement, they frequently become insular. They design programs which respond to what they want to do, rather than what their clientele wants them to do. They can become defensive when criticized, concentrating on defending past practice and relying on existing policies to maintain the status quo. A second incentive lies in libraries' responsibilities to contribute to their parent institutions' missions and their recognition that this cannot be done effectively without some formal approach to assessment. A third - and perhaps most important - incentive is the opportunity that assessment provides for improving library performance. An understanding of the relative success of current programs helps libraries adapt to new user needs and demands, introduce new programs, and phase out existing programs. Performance improvement occurs most successfully when it builds on recognized strengths, and performance assessment helps to identify those strengths.

Problems in Assessing Library Services. Research libraries have tended to place more emphasis on evaluating collections and technical services in the past, and the consequent lack of experience in assessing services has led to a lack of tools and techniques for such an assessment. Another difficulty arises because of the nature of academic library users. Their limited understanding of library programs, potential programs, and constraints demands caution when dealing with users' perceptions of library performance. The diversity of clientele requires libraries to understand needs of various subsets of users and to make difficult program decisions which almost inevitably favor one or more of these subsets over others. Another problem relates to the difficulty of quantifying many service programs. Measures such as level of use, frequency of use and expended time on a service task do not measure quality of service and must be interpreted with caution.

The Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC) is operated by the Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Studies, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Telephone (202) 232-8656.

Approaches to Service Assessment. One important technique that most libraries use in determining user needs and demands is user segmentation. This involves the collection of library performance data as viewed or experienced by subsets of clientele. These subsets typically are defined in general terms, such as faculty, graduate students and undergraduate students, but in some instances are broken down further by academic department or major, seniority at the institution, or frequency of library use. Libraries have found that the more specific the breakdown, the more useful the assessment data might be, but also the more costly to collect. The intent is to identify the different kinds of library needs held by various, definable groups of users.

Most libraries have designed and carried out user surveys to determine their users' perceptions of the success of library programs. They have been used to identify major problem areas and/or major groups with particular problems. The formats of surveys vary, as do the sampling techniques and the usefulness of the results. One danger which many libraries have recognized is that user perceptions may not reflect reality; negative results from a survey may indeed call for a change in library programs, but might also call for a different kind of user education program.

Another approach to the assessment of library services is availability or access studies. This technique measures the satisfaction rate for users seeking specific materials at the library. Some methods provide a gross satisfaction rate and then provide information on why dissatisfactions occur. The library's response can then be directed at the specific problems, whether, for example, the library is purchasing the wrong material, or users are not using the catalog effectively, or high demand material is being stolen.

In-house use studies have been carried out at several libraries, and provide a perspective on what kinds of materials are in heavy demand and, alternatively, what kinds are not being used. The results can help the library make decisions regarding weeding programs, storage collections, and location of material. Facilities use studies have been carried out by libraries interested in reviewing the physical arrangement of materials, service points, furniture and equipment, and various configurations of study carrels and tables. Other specialized assessments include reviews of specific services such as interlibrary loan or library instruction. These assessments are frequently designed to capture users' perceptions on how well the services are operated, how important they are to them, and what can be done to improve them.

It has become apparent to libraries that it is both useful and important to understand the needs and demands of the various subsets of their clientele and to match the array of available services to those needs and demands. Assessment of services can provide helpful information to adapt library programs to the changing needs of users and to make the difficult choices of emphasizing certain services over others.

SPEC Kit #71 on User Surveys & Evaluation of Library Services (2/81) contains seven examples of general user surveys and eight examples of user surveys on specific issues. The 107-page kit is available for $7.50 to ARL members and SPEC subscribers and $15.00 to all others -- plus a $2.00 per order handling fee and an additional $3.00 if invoice is required -- from: SPEC , ARL Office of Management Studies, 1527 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C., 20036.

GENERAL USER SATISFACTION SURVEYS

ISSN - 0160 - 3582

USER SURVEYS & EVALUATION OF LIBRARY SERVICES*
SPEC KIT #71

February 1981

PAGE

GENERAL USER SATISFACTION SURVEYS

Library User Survey,Final Report. University of California/Riverside 1

Methodology
Results
Questionnaires
- Use of collections
- Use of services
- Card catalog use

Elmer Holmes Bobst Library: A User Survey, Spring 1976. New York University 13

Methodology
Questionnaires
- Use of Library and suggestions for improvement
Statistics

Report of the Task Force on Library Services to Undergraduates. University of California/Los Angeles 35

Methodology/needs analysis
Recommendations
Questionnaires--staff & student

Faculty and Graduate Student Questionnaires on the Adequacy of Existing Services and Possible New Services. Emory University 57

On-Site Library Use Survey. University of Colorado 69

Physical facility use

On-Site Library Use Survey. University of New Mexico 70

Materials use/availability

On-Site Library Use Survey. Colorado State 71

Facilities
Collections access

*SEE ALSO SPEC KITS #56 AND #25.

PAGE

USER SURVEYS ON SPECIFIC ISSUES

Availability Analysis Report. Arizona State 73

Methodology
Comparison with other libraries
Recommendations

Undergraduate Library Availability Study 1975-1977. University of Tennessee 83

Methodology
Implications

User Assistance Tally. University of Georgia 91

Methodology
Statistics use

Faculty Questionnaire on Branch and Divisional Libraries. University of Colorado 97

Term Paper Workshop Evaluation. University of Colorado 100

Literature Search Evaluation. University of Kentucky 102

Search Services User Questionnaire and Availability of Citations Questionnaire. Boston University 103

Executive Summary of a Library User Survey to Determine the Libraries' Research Support Performance and Capabilities. Cornell University 106

April-May 1980

University of California, Riverside

Library User Survey

Final Report

Introduction

The Library undertook a user survey during the Spring Quarter between April 14 and May 23, 1980. The purpose of the survey was to gather opinions regarding the Library's collections and services.

Methodology

Four different questionnaires were used in the survey: 1) Use of Library Collections Questionnaire, which was designed to gather perceptions regarding the Library's collections and measure the success patrons had in using the collections; 2) Use of Library Services Questionnaire, which asked questions regarding perceptions of the various services the Library offers; 3) Card Catalog Questionnaire, which was designed to gather information about how patrons use the catalog, and how adequate they thought is was; and 4) Media Study Center Questionnaire, which was designed specifically to gather opinions about the Media Study Center.

Participation in the survey was entirely voluntary and anonymous. The first three questionnaires were placed in boxes distributed in the Bio-Agricultural, General, Music, and Physical Sciences Libraries. Signs inviting patrons to pick up the questionnaires were posted by the boxes.

In the General Library, questionnaires were also handed out to patrons according to the following schedules:

	Morning	Afternoon	Evening
Sunday	-	2-3	8-9
Monday - Thursday	10-11	2-3	8-9
Friday	10-11	2-3	-
Saturday	-	1-2	-

For the first 20 minutes of the hour, the Catalog Use Questionnaire was handed out around the public catalog, and in the remaining time the Use of Library Collections and the Use of Library Services questionnaires were handed out on each floor of the Library.

Because some of the questions were geared to a specific visit, some patrons may have filled out more than one of the same questionnaires.

Data Processing

Each day the questionnaires were picked up, dated, and sent to the Library Systems Office for key punching. Each of the questionnaires provided space for making comments or suggestions. About half of the questionnaires filled out contained comments, and because many of these comments were lengthy, it was immediately decided that these would have to be manually summarized. The presence of a comment, however, was indicated in the record.

Those questionnaires which contained comments relevant to a specific library department were xeroxed and sent to the appropriate department. All of the comments are summarized in Appendix Two of this report.

The key punched data was tabulated and analyzed utilizing the Statistical Analysis System.

Results

A total of 1584 questionnaires were filled out, 1249 in the General Library, 172 in the Bio-Agricultural Library, 95 in the Physical Sciences Library, 35 in the Music Library and 33 in the Media Study Center. 609 Use of Library Collections Questionnaires, 649 Use of Library Services Questionnaires, 296 Card Catalog Questionnaires, and 33 Media Study Questionnaires were filled out. 55% of the respondents were undergraduate students, 21% graduate students, 5% faculty, 4% staff, and 15% others, which included students and faculty from other colleges and universities, high school students, alumni, and citizens from the area.

It should be kept in mind that most of the responses were from the General Library (79%) and 60% of the General Library respondents were undergraduate students, so that overall results are biased towards the undergraduate user of the General Library.

Appendix One displays the responses received for each of the questionnaires in six sections:

1. All Libraries
2. General Library
3. Bio-Agricultural Library
4. Physical Sciences Library
5. Music Library
6. Media Study Questionnaire

For each question, two numbers are given, one is the percentage of respondents who answered that question in the way indicated, and the other in parenthesis, is the actual number of respondents who made that response.

As can be seen from looking at these results, the overwhelming majority of the responses were very positive, and patrons seem to have a very favorable opinion of the UCR libraries. It was heartening to learn that overall, 99% of the respondents believe the library's services were excellent or satisfactory, 97% believed they were very likely or likely to find what they were looking for in the library's collections, 96% found the card catalog to be more than adequate or adequate, and 94% found their visit to the library to be successful. This is not to say that there isn't room for improvement, but it does indicate the library has a very positive image in the minds of its patrons. More detailed findings are presented below under specific headings.

User Population

If we make the assumption that the questionnaires returned is a valid sample of the user population of these libraries, it appears the clientele varies from library to library.

	U C R				
	Undergrad.	Grad.	Faculty	Staff	Other
General Library	60	18	2	3	17
Bio-Ag	26	43	17	8	6
Phy. Sci.	44	28	12	6	10
Music	49	20	31	0	0
Media	85	9	3	0	3

The Music Library and Media Study Center are almost exclusively used by UCR students and faculty; the General Library and the Media Study Center are heavily used by undergraduates, whereas the Sciences Libraries are more heavily used by graduates and faculty. The General Library is used more by other patrons than the branch libraries. However, this data must be considered indicative only, because there is no way to test our assumption that a random sample of the user population was achieved.

Use of the Library

Combining data from the Use of Library Services and the Use of Library Collections questionnaires we learn that overall, 49% of the respondents came to the library to locate material for use. The data displayed below from the Use of Library Services questionnaire, indicates that the purposes of respondent's visits vary from library to library.

Purpose of Visit	General Library	Bio-Ag.	Phy. Sci.	Music
To study	51	31	25	26
To locate materials	36	58	61	37
Other	13	11	14	37

The General Library is used more often as a place to study than the branch libraries. Some of the other reasons for using the library cited were to type, work, write, read, use the copying facilities, use reserve books, research, browse, and listen to sound recordings.

37% of the respondents indicated they use the library more than twice a week, 29% use it daily, 23% weekly, and 11% monthly or less. It is interesting to note that branch libraries seem to be used by the respondents at a higher frequency than the General Library: 66% of the respondents use the General Library daily or more than twice a week, 69% in the Physical Sciences Library, 74% in the Bio-Agricultural Library and 86% in the Music Library. The Media Study Center on the other hand is used weekly by the majority of the respondents (64%).

There appears to be a correlation between how often a respondent visits the library and what the purpose of the visit is. The less often a patron visits the library, the more likely it is that they came to the library to locate materials for use.

Frequency of visit	% who came to locate materials
Monthly or less	80
Weekly	70
More than twice a week	53
Daily	50

Library Services

As mentioned above, 99% of the respondents indicated that the library's services are excellent or satisfactory. In the Bio-Agricultural and Physical Sciences libraries, over 70% of the respondents thought the services were excellent as contrasted with over 50% in the General and Music libraries. No respondent believed the services were unsatisfactory in the Physical Sciences and Music libraries. It is interesting to note that more of the faculty or other respondents found the library's services unsatisfactory, whereas 1% of the undergraduates, 2% of the graduates, and 4% of the staff respondents indicated that they found services unsatisfactory.

A total of 12% of the respondents indicated that they had been misdirected from one service point to another, and this varied from library to library: 14% in the General Library, 3% in the Bio-Agricultural Library, 7% in the Physical Sciences Library, and 12% in the Music Library.

Most respondents indicated that their visit to the library was successful or very successful (94%). This varied somewhat from library to library, as will be seen below.

	Very Successful	Successful	Unsuccessful
General Library	29	65	6
Bio-Ag Library	33	55	12
Phy. Sci. Library	41	59	0
Music Library	27	67	6

One of the problems with the Use of Library Services questionnaire is that there apparently was some ambiguity in question number eight, which asked respondents to indicate how helpful they had found various services they had used during the year. From the responses received, it appears that some respondents marked services as not helpful when they either had no need for them or were unaware of that service. For example Educational Services was rated as not helpful by 23% of the respondents from the Bio-Agricultural Library, 33% from the Physical Sciences Library, and 40% from the Music Library, but it seems unlikely that patrons of the Sciences and Music libraries would regularly use Educational Services. The intent of the question was to have the service rendered evaluated, not whether or not the service unit itself was useful to the respondent. Therefore the data must be considered indicative.

In the aggregate, the following areas were indicated not helpful in more than ten percent of the responses: Collection Development, Computer Literature Searching, Educational Services, Government Publications, Interlibrary Loans, and Special Collections. This may mean that some of these services are not well known, and that some effort might be called for to improve the services or make them better understood.

To conclude this section on a more positive note, 94% of the respondents rated pleasantness in the Library as being excellent or satisfactory.

Collections

Most respondents indicated that they are likely or more than likely to find what they want in the Library (97%), and in the Physical Sciences and Music libraries, none of the respondents thought it was unlikely they would find what they wanted. It is interesting none of the faculty and staff thought it unlikely they would find what they wanted whereas 7% of the graduate students, 2% of the undergraduates, and 5% of others thought it unlikely they would find what they wanted.

A direct correlation was found between the size of the Library, and respondents success in finding the materials they were looking for.

Find?	Overall	Gen. Lib.	Bio-Ag	Phy. Sci.	Music
YES	79	77	83	85	88
NO	21	23	17	15	12

Apparently the meaning of question five of the Use of Library Collections questionnaire was unclear to respondents. Question five had three parts; the first was "Did you find the materials you were looking for today?" If the answer was no, then two additional questions were asked: (1) "Was the item you wanted listed in the card catalog?" and (2) "Was the item on the shelf?" The intent of the questions was to determine why respondents didn't find what they were looking for; was it because what they wanted was not in the collection, or was it because it was listed as being in the collection, but was not on the shelf. Statistically, however, it appears that many of those who found what they were looking for, also answered the additional two questions. 83 out of 397 respondents indicated they had not found what they were looking for. The two additional questions had 180 and 274 responses respectively. It is not possible, therefore, to make any accurate deductions about why respondents didn't find what they were looking for.

It is surprising to learn that 51% of the respondents were not aware of the in-process shelves in the General Library, and of those that were aware of them, 56% did not find having the in-process books of any help to them. Perhaps patrons do not really understand the potential benefit the in-process shelves could have for them.

Appendix Two contains many comments regarding the Library's collections, and it is apparent that there is a high level of satisfaction with the Library's collections.

Card Catalog

The survey yielded some unexpected results with regard to the card catalog. Most surveys in the literature have concluded that the subject approach is used less often than the Author/Title approach by catalog users. This survey revealed that 66% of the respondents were looking in the card catalog under a subject, rather than an author or title. It is interesting that the branch libraries indicate less use of the subject approach than in the General Library:

Library	Subject Approach
General Library	68%
Bio-Agricultural Library	56%
Physical Sciences	36%
Music Library	16%

It appears that the more specialized a collection is, the less likely the patrons are to use a subject approach. It should be pointed out that the Music Library catalog does not provide a subject approach to scores, but does for recordings.

Another curious finding was that staff (all staff except faculty) had the lowest rate of success in using the card catalogs (58%) and other users had the highest success rate (86%). Faculty (81%) and undergraduates (85%) appear to have greater success than graduates (76%).

On the other hand, none of the staff who responded thought the card catalog was inadequate, whereas 17% of the faculty respondents believed the card catalog was inadequate. In general, however, most of the respondents who found the card catalog more than adequate were successful in using the card catalog (93%).

Facilities

It appears that the facilities of the Library are in need of some improvement. The following were indicated as areas in need of improvement by the given percentage of respondents in each of the libraries:

	Overall	Gen. Lib.	Bio-Ag	Phy. Sci.	Music
Vending Machines	43	41	49	52	44
Availability of Typewriters	30	26	58	54	20
Temperature	26	26	24	22	35
Availability of Carrels	23	22	30	32	0
Seating	21	18	32	39	19
Ventilation	18	19	17	17	0
Quietness	18	17	33	12	12
Lighting	7	7	11	7	0

These results, along with the comments summarized in Appendix Two clearly indicate an improvement in facilities is desired. It should be noted that the intensity of concern for these areas vary somewhat from library to library.

Media Study Center

As mentioned above, the Media Study Center is used primarily by UCR undergraduate students (85%), and 64% of the users visit the center weekly, 24% more than twice a week. 94% of the respondents indicated the services were either excellent or satisfactory. 68% came to the facility to listen to a cassette or audio tape, and 20% to participate in a language class. 100% indicated their visit to the center was either very successful (41%) or success-

ful (59%). All the respondents found the services very helpful or helpful, and the staff well or moderately informed. Only one respondent indicated the staff was not attentive, the rest believed staff were either very attentive (58%) or attentive (39%).

The major problem in the facility appears to be noise, since 42% of the respondents indicated noise was a problem. Equipment malfunction was experienced by 33% of the respondents, but evidently these problems are quickly taken care of, since there are no on-going, or long term equipment problems.

The typical user of the Media Study Center is an undergraduate student who uses the facility once a week for purposes of studying language. The satisfaction appears to be high, with very few complaints except for noise and equipment malfunction.

1. ALL LIBRARIES

The University Library
University of California, Riverside

USE OF LIBRARY COLLECTIONS QUESTIONNAIRE

WE NEED YOUR HELP. The Library is attempting to determine how satisfied you are when using this Library. This information will assist us in improving the Library's collections. Please take a few minutes to answer the following questions.

Date_____Time_____a.m. p.m.

1. I am a:
   - 55 UCR undergraduate student (876)
   - 21 UCR graduate student (328)
   - 5 UCR faculty member (78)
   - 4 UCR staff (59)
   - 15 Other (Please Specify) (239) _____

2. How often do you visit this Library? (1283)

   - 11 monthly or less
   - 23 weekly
   - 37 more than twice a week
   - 29 daily

3. Which statement best describes your overall expectation that the Library's collections will have what you are looking for? (601)

   42 very likely 55 likely 3 unlikely

4. Did you come to the Library today to locate materials for use? (605)

   59 yes 41 no

5. Did you find the materials you were looking for today? (397) 79 yes 21 no

   If no:

   (1) Was the item you wanted listed in the card catalog? (180) 68 yes 32 no

   If no, please write down the author and title. (The Collection Development Department will review for possible acquisition.)

   (66 responses)

   _____

   _____

   _____

   (2) Was the item on the shelf? (274) 74 yes 26 no

   If no: Please write down the call number and title, so the Circulation Department may search for it. If you would like to be notified, please give us your name, zebra number, and telephone number.

   (32 responses)

PLEASE TURN OVER

6. Please make any comments or suggestions you like regarding the Library and its collections. (332 responses)

Please leave this questionnaire at the box by the check-out desk as you exit the Library. Thank you for your assistance.

ALL LIBRARIES

The University Library
University of California, Riverside

USE OF LIBRARY SERVICES QUESTIONNAIRE

WE NEED YOUR HELP. The Library is attempting to determine how satisfied you are when using this Library. This information will assist us in improving Library services. Please take a few minutes to answer the following questions.

Date_____Time_____a.m. p.m.

1. I am a: _____UCR undergraduate student
   _____UCR graduate student
   _____UCR faculty member
   _____UCR staff
   _____Other (Please Specify)_____

2. How often do you visit this Library?

   _____monthly or less
   _____weekly
   _____more than twice a week
   _____daily

3. Which statement best describes your overall opinion of this Library's services? (630)

   55 excellent 44 satisfactory 1 unsatisfactory

4. Have you ever been misdirected from one Library service point to another that was also not appropriate to your needs? 12 yes 88 no (623)

5. Are you aware of the in-process stacks where books that are not yet cataloged are available for browsing? 49 yes 51 no (635)

   If yes, has having the in-process books available been of any help to you? (305)
   44 yes 56 no

6. Please rate each item below according to your experience in this Library:

		Excellent	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement
Lighting	(636)	52	41	7
Ventilation	(636)	36	46	18
Temperature	(637)	28	46	26
Quietness	(638)	25	57	18
Pleasantness	(629)	48	46	6
Vending Machines	(517)	14	432	43
Availability of Carrels	(484)	20	57	23
Availability of Typewriters	(415)	17	53	30
Seating	(619)	28	51	21

7. What was the purpose of your visit to this Library today?

   a. 46 to study (352)
   b. 41 to locate books or other items for use (308)
   c. 13 other (Please Specify) (101)_____

_____

PLEASE TURN OVER

8. For those library services listed below which you have used during the current academic year, please indicate how helpful they have been:

	Very Helpful	Helpful	Not Helpful
Circulation (check-out services) (469)	65	34	1
Collection Development (233)	38	50	12
Computer Literature Searching (201)	42	41	17
Educational Services (158)	42	40	18
Government Publications (251)	47	42	11
Interlibrary Loans (247)	50	34	16
Photoduplication (337)	56	37	7
Reference (456)	66	32	2
Serials (331)	63	33	4
Special Collections (182)	48	40	12
Other (Please Specify) (29 responses)			

9. Was your visit to the Library today: (594)

30 very successful 64 successful 6 unsuccessful

10. Please make any comments or suggestions you like regarding the Library and its services. (e.g., hours opened, loan period, physical arrangement signs, brochures, etc.) (322 responses)

Please leave this questionnaire in the box by the check-out desk as you exit the Library. Thank you for your assistance.

ALL LIBRARIES

The University Library
University of California, Riverside

CARD CATALOG USE QUESTIONNAIRE

WE NEED YOUR HELP. The Library is attempting to determine how well the card catalog is meeting your needs in finding Library materials. Please take a few minutes to answer the following questions.

Date_____Time_____a.m. p.m.

1. I am a: _____UCR undergraduate student
   _____UCR graduate student
   _____UCR faculty member
   _____UCR staff member
   _____Other (Please Specify)_____

2. What information were you looking for in the card catalog: (282)

34 { 18 known item (book)
   16 A/T

   66 subject

3. Were you successful in using the card catalog to find this information? (281)
   83 yes 17 no

   If no, please describe any difficulties you encountered:_____

4. What is your opinion of the usefulness and accuracy of the card catalog? (287)
   36 more than adequate 60 adequate 4 inadequate

5. Do you have any comments or suggestions regarding the card catalog (e.g., the arrangement, filing, structure, cross references, aids to the catalog, etc.)?

   (130 comments)

Please deposit this questionnaire in the box by the reference desk or by the check out desk. Thank you for your assistance.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

ELMER HOLMES BOBST LIBRARY:

A USER SURVEY

SPRING 1976

Introduction

The Elmer Holmes Bobst Library and Study Center of New York University is the largest open stack library in New York City, and one of the largest open stack research libraries in the United States. It was formally opened in the Fall of 1973. This construction of a new major library building was, in part, a result of the New York University Self-Study, 1956, which encouraged its existence. In fact, a basic recommendation of the Self Study was to erect a new library building. Chief features of this proposed building, for the user, included a readily accessible Study Hall and Reserve Books floor, large collections of reference works and periodicals on open display near the street level, and central stack extending through several floors with a number of seats and cubicles placed around these stacks. By and large, these recommendations were incorporated into the Bobst Library.

By the Fall of 1975, it was easy to see that some of the goals of the library, directly involving users, were being accomplished. The building attracted many people, as many as 3,000 per day. The first year's statistics showed 500,000 turnstile entrances and 270,000 book transactions during this period. These totals increased the second year. And yet, where people went once they were in the building, why they were present, and what they were after, were questions that could only be answered by observation and empirical comment. The same was true for the users'

attitudes about the collection and the services provided. The library believed, for accurate resource planning, that it was necessary to collect more specific data than this.

Method

A questionnaire, chosen from a number of user surveys current in the academic library field, and modified for Bobst Library purposes with the assistance of the Deans, faculty and library staff was presented to the Deans Council in December, 1975. The Council approved the format and allowed the testing to take place in University classroom sites during class times. The Council supported the idea that the classroom canvassing would predict a guaranteed high return of all NYU students, not only the "conscientious" element that might fill and return a mail sampling. Each school accepted responsibility for selecting representative students for the testing, and for coordinating the activity with the appropriate faculty. This was done entirely on a voluntary basis as was filling out the questionnaire itself. Table I provides a statistical summary of total points as distributed in the schools in September, 1975, and shows how the survey reflects this distribution in its sampling. This count reflects approximately 10% of the students enrolled in the schools. A pilot of the survey, conducted in the library in January, 1976, included 100 student volunteers, who were requested to comment on any problem or confusion that the survey reflected. These comments

were noted and minor changes made. Classroom visits began in February and ran through March, 1976.

As often as possible the survey was introduced by a faculty member of the library as follows: "The Bobst Library has been open for almost two and one-half years now, with little opportunity to question users, in a formal way, about the building and its services. We welcome this occasion to ask you to evaluate our collection and staff. The questionnaire allows for you to tell us what you like and what you would like to see, to perhaps recommend something new or make comment on what is present. Thank you for your cooperation on this project".

Initial Report

The accumulation of data allowed a first report to be presented to the Deans Council in April. Each school received a copy of the Composite Statistics (see Composite Statistics) as well as an individual breakdown of the Composite for each school's participants. Included with the report were tables reflecting a summary of participating students and the distribution of these students as to Academic Levels (tables II, III). The composite indicated certain observations or patterns of use that were reported to the Deans as follows:

1. The majority of students use the library for course related assignments, research or study facilities; they rarely use the premises for social purposes.

2. The services rendered by library faculty and staff, when asked for, are well received. A majority of students do not request this assistance on a frequent or regular basis.

3. Books on the open stacks are the most frequently used resource, with Reserve, Periodicals, and Reference materials also in heavy demand.

4. A majority of students would consider consolidation of the periodicals in one area (excluding Science) to be helpful.

5. Students are generally unaware of Library orientation or instructional programs.

6. The collection is perceived to be in good physical condition.

7. The current library hours are adequate.

By the end of the Spring semester, the data collected could be arranged in other ways than the composite form. This report is intended to allow the Library to use this information, in its planning of resources and commitments for the University community, with regard to the University's major component, its student body.

Data Collection

The survey, as distributed, comprised five mimeo pages on standard office stationery. Page one listed seven items, or variables, including school, level, residence, age, status as full-time or part-time, and financial aid. Pages two through

five detailed 22 questions including a schedule of library hours. Multiple choice answers were also listed to be checked.

Survey forms were coded, punched, and then tabulated. Each response was prescribed on a punched card. Each column represented a question and each row an answer. Multiple punches were used to register more than one answer per question.

The Respondents

There are 1748 respondents distributed as in Table 3: WSUC (513), SEHNAP (445), GSAS (194), BPA (165), SOA (154), GPA (116), SSW (90), and SCE (71). The population, as distributed, attempted to draw quotas from each school according to the total point counts as reported in September, 1975. These quotas were generally met with the exception of BPA.

The participants consisted on 52% undergraduate, 47% graduates, and 1% special students.

The residential distribution shows 70% commuters, as against 18% off campus Greenwich Village, and 11% on campus.

The age distribution centers between 18-24 years, at 63%, 25-30 years at 22%, 31-35 years at 7% and the rest at 8%.

The proportion of women to men is 54% for the former, and 45% for the latter. The is 1% no reply. (eg. in SEHNAP the proportion of female to male is 386 F and 56M. This represents of the 445 answers, 87% F, 12%M and 1% not identified).

The full-timers stand at 73% and the part-timers 26% and 1% no answer.

The findings on Financial Aid show that 53% received no financial assistance, 43% received some financial aid, 3% were on work study programs, and 2% no answer.

Data Analysis

The statistical summaries presented are to show how the participants felt about aspects of library use. A frequency of use variable has been identified to study 1) usage, 2) satisfaction with services, and 3) suggested improvements. This variable is called heavy if respondents use the library at least once weekly, and light if respondents use the library on less frequent intervals. This data has been reduced to percentiles, using two digit figures, with the "no answer" category excluded. The data has been arranged in a decreasing order of preference for the convenience of visualizing an analytical viewpoint. The sum total 1,748 participants in the survey includes 970 "heavy" users, and 758 "light" users.

LIBRARY USAGE

A) How much

Heavy: 57% of the respondents fell into this classification. Reasons cited for non-use of Bobst include 27% who don't have enough time or find it difficult to get materials, 12 % who don't need library materials for school work, 11% who buy their own

magazines and books, and 23% cite other reasons. 44% spend at least one hour per visitation and 46% spend in excess of two hours per visit.

Light: 43% of the respondents fall into this classification. Reasons cited for non-use of Bobst include 27% who don't have enough time, 17% who believe it is difficult to get materials or who buy their own materials, 16% who have no need of library materials for school work, and 23% who cite other reasons. Only 34% spend more than two hours per visit, while 38% spend at least one hour and 28% spend less than one hour per visit.

	HEAVY USER TOTAL %	LIGHT USER TOTAL %
I VISIT BOBST LIBRARY		
1. 1-5 TIMES/DAILY, OR WEEKLY	57	0
2. 1-3 TIMES/MONTHLY	0	43
TOTAL & PERCENT	57	43
I DO NOT USE BOBST LIBRARY BECAUSE		
3. DONT HAVE ENOUGH TIME	27	27
4. DIFFICULT TO GET MATERIALS	27	17
1. BUY MY OWN MAGAZINE & BOOKS	11	17
5. NO NEED FOR SCHOOL WORK	12	16
2. USE OFF-CAMPUS LIBRARIES	7	12
7. OTHER REASONS	12	6
6. DONT LIKE LIBRARIES	4	5
TOTAL	100	100
AVERAGE TIME I SPENT AT BOBST		
2. LESS THAN TWO HOURS	44	38
3. OVER TWO HOURS	46	34
1. LESS THAN ONE HOUR	10	28
TOTAL	100	100

B) For what purpose

Heavy: The library function is to support study, teaching and research. 35% of users in this category study using their own materials and 32% use library materials for course work as primary purposes for library visits. They also use Bobst to circulate books (22%) and do research (20%). 56% emphasize that the library is never used for social reasons.

Light: 47% use Bobst to find materials for course work as the primary purpose; they also use the library to do research (24%), charge or return books (23%), or study their own materials (19%). 81% of these users state they never use the library for social reasons.

	HEAVY USER TOTAL %	LIGHT USER TOTAL %
MY PRIMARY PURPOSE TO THE LIBRARY		
3. FIND MATERIALS FOR A COURSE	32	47
4. DO RESEARCH	16	19
2. STUDY MY OWN MATERIALS	35	14
1. CHARGE/RETURN BOOKS	9	14
9. OTHER	2	3
6. LISTEN TO MUSIC	1	2
5. DO CASUAL READING	4	1
8. USE BOOK LOCKER	1	0
7. ATTEND CLASS	*	*
TOTAL	100	100
I ALSO USE BOBST TO		
4. DO RESEARCH	20	24
1. CHARGE/RETURN/RENEW BOOKS	22	23
3. FIND & USE MATERIALS	24	21
2. STUDY, USING MY OWN MATERIALS	17	19
5. DO CASUAL READING	10	5
9. OTHER	2	4
6. LISTEN TO MUSIC	3	3
7. ATTEND CLASS	*	1
8. USE BOOK LOCKER	2	*
TOTAL	100	100
I USE BOBST FOR SOCIAL REASONS		
4. NEVER	56	81
3. LESS THAN 50% OF MY VISITS	36	16
2. MORE THAN 50% OF MY VISITS	6	2
1. ON EVERY VISIT	2	1
TOTAL	100	100

C) Which materials and resources

Heavy: The subject areas used consistently are Humanities (16%), Social Sciences (19%), and Psychology (12%), with the greatest frequency occurring in Humanities (17%), Social Sciences (16%), Business and Economics (13%), and Applied Science (12%). The resources used most consistently are general stacks (24%), Reserve (22%), Periodicals/Newspapers (21%), and the Reference collection (16%). The greatest frequency of use occurs in the general stacks (41%).

Light: The subject areas used consistently are Social Sciences (16%), Humanities (14%), Psychology (13%) and Applied Sciences (13%), and Education (10%), with the greatest frequency occurring in Applied Science (16%) followed by the Humanities and Social Sciences at 12% each. The resources used most consistently are books from general stacks (25%), Reserve materials (23%), Periodicals/Newspapers (20%), and the Reference collection (19%). The greatest frequency of use is again the general stacks (36%).

	HEAVY USER TOTAL %	LIGHT USER TOTAL %
THE SUBJECT AREAS I USE ARE		
7. SOCIAL SCIENCES	19	16
3. HUMANITIES	16	14
9. PSYCHOLOGY	12	13
6. SIENCE, APPLIED	9	13
1. EDUCATION	7	10
11. FILM, DRAMA, CINEMA	6	8
10. BUSINESS, ECONOMICS	9	7
8. PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION	3	5
4. MUSIC	4	4
2. SOCIAL WORK	5	4
5. SCIENCE, PURE	7	3
12. OTHER	3	3
TOTAL	100	100
I USE THE SUBJECT AREA MOST OFTEN		
6. SIENCE, APPLIED	12	16
3. HUMANITIES	17	12
7. SOCIAL SCIENCES	16	12
11. FILM, DRAMA, CINEMA	5	10
10. BUSINESS, ECONOMICS	15	9
1. EDUCATION	5	8
9. PSYCHOLOGY	8	6
8. PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION	5	7
2. SOCIAL WORK	5	5
5. SCIENCE, PURE	9	5
12. OTHER	8	5
4. MUSIC	2	3
TOTAL	100	100
I USE THE FOLLOWING RESOURCES		
4. BOOKS FROM GENERAL STACKS	24	25
2. RESERVE	22	23
1. PERIODICALS/NEWSPAPER	21	20
3. REFERENCE COLLECTION	16	19
5. MICROFORMS	7	5
8. MUSIC LISTENING	4	3
7. GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS	4	3
9. OTHER	1	1
6. INSTRUCTIONAL MEDIA CENTER	1	1
TOTAL	100	100
1 THE PARTICULAR RESOURCE WHICH I USE		
4. BOOKS FROM GENERAL STACKS	41	36
2. RESERVE	21	23
1. PERIODICALS/NEWSPAPER	18	18
3. REFERENCE COLLECTION	14	15
8. MUSIC LISTENING	2	4
9. OTHER	1	2

USER SATISFACTION

A) With library resources and their availability

Heavy: The expectation rate in finding materials is: about 48% felt that the probability of finding materials is good, while 8% checked excellent. About 30% indicated fair, 12% poor, and 2% believed that the question did not apply. About 50% felt their abilities to locate materials made the task possible, while 33% made the task probable and 17% felt little confidence in locating books. That books in the catalog are on the shelves refers to the availability of the materials. About 50% felt that it happens sometimes, 34% of the respondents checked that they "usually" could find books, and 16% rarely found that which they were seeking. With open stacks in the Bobst Library, the users can browse over and often select substitute titles. The great majority of users perceived the collection to be in good to excellent physical condition.

Light: The expectation rate in finding materials is: about 45% felt that the probability of finding materials is good, while 5% checked excellent. About 30% indicated fair, 15% poor and 2% believed the question did not apply. About 52% felt their abilities to locate materials made the task possible, while 28% made the task probable, and 20% felt little confidence in locating books. As to the availability of materials: about 52% felt

that it happens sometimes, 30% believed it the case usually, and 18% of the respondents checked they could rarely find materials. Again, the great majority of users judged the physical condition of the books to be good to excellent.

	HEAVY USER TOTAL %	LIGHT USER TOTAL %
MY SUCCESS IN FINDING MATERIALS IS		
2. GOOD	48	45
3. FAIR	30	30
4. POOR	12	15
1. EXCELLENT	8	5
5. QUESTION DOES NOT APPLY	2	5
TOTAL	100	100
MY ABILITY TO FIND MATERIALS		
2. SOMETIMES ABLE TO FIND	50	52
1. USUALLY ABLE TO FIND	33	28
3. RARELY ABLE TO FIND	17	20
TOTAL	100	100
BOOKS ARE ON THE SHELVES		
2. SOMETIMES	50	52
1. USUALLY	34	30
3. RARELY	16	18
TOTAL	100	100
THE PHYSICAL CONDITION OF THE MATERIALS		
2. GOOD	64	65
3. FAIR	16	16
1. EXCELLENT	17	14
5. QUESTION DOES NOT APPLY	1	3
4. POOR	2	2
TOTAL	100	100

B) With library staff and service

Heavy: Under the heading "the services I receive from librarians" there are five choices. About 52% felt the service was good, 19% thought it was excellent, 16% considered it to be fair, 4% felt it was poor, and 9% of the participants said the question does not apply. The question asking how often the librarians are asked for assistance was answered as follows: 47% requested assistance occasionally, 31% asked at infrequent intervals, 12% depended on their guidance generally, and 10% answered never. The question on library orientation, etc. shows that the majority of students are unaware of their existence.

Light: About 47% believed the services received from librarians was good, 14% thought it was excellent, 20% considered it to be fair, 3% felt it was poor, and 16% said the question didn't apply. The librarians were asked for assistance as follows: 43% requested assistance occasionally, 29% asked at infrequent intervals, 16% depended on their guidance generally and 12% responded "never". The question on library orientation revealed that 78% of the participants were unaware of them.

	HEAVY USER TOTAL %	LIGHT USER TOTAL %
SERVICES I RECEIVE FROM THE LIBNS		
2. GOOD	52	47
3. FAIR	16	20
5. QUESTION DOES NOT APPLY	9	16
1. EXCELLENT	19	14
4. POOR	4	3
TOTAL	100	100
I ASK THE LIBRARIANS FOR ASSISTANCE		
2. OCCASIONALLY	47	43
3. ON RARE OCCASIONAS	31	29
1. GENERALLY	12	16
4. NEVER	10	12
TOTAL	100	100
LIBRARY ORIENTATION, ETC.		
3. NOT AWARE OF THEM	70	78
1. HELPFUL	15	12
2. OF LITTLE USE	8	7
4. OTHER	7	3
TOTAL	100	100

C) With library hours

Heavy: Referring to hours of the collections, about 55% thought they were adequate, 27% thought the hours more than adequate, and 18% felt they were less than adequate.

Light: About 58% believed the hours were adequate, 30% thought they were nore than adequate, and 12% indicated they were less than adequate.

	HEAVY USER TOTAL %	LIGHT USER TOTAL %
PRESENT LIBRARY HOURS ARE		
2. ADEQUATE	55	58
1. MORE THAN ADEQUATE	27	30
3. LESS THAN ADEQUATE	18	12
TOTAL	100	100

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING SERVICES

A) Given our limited resources, what is the option to improve library services.

Heavy: About 20% checked that more copies of titles would help, while 23% picked this as the first alternate. 16% hoped for new titles and 17% picked this as the second choice. Another 13% requested increasing the hours of study. while 12% preferred assistance in the stacks. These last two options garnered 12% in the alternative category each.

Light: About 23% checked that more copies of titles would help and 24% picked this category as the alternative. The "light" user, perhaps die to unfamiliarity with the library layout, preferred assistance in the book stacks (15%), and more new titles, (14%) as the next likely choices. In the alternative category, the desire for new titles went up to 17% and assistance in the book stacks and quicker circulation each received 13% of the alternative picks.

B) Central Services: periodicals

Heavy: About 53% would like the periodicals consolidated, it makes little difference to 28% of the users, and 19% prefer the present arrangement.

Light: About 55% felt the consolidation of periodicals would be helpful, it wouldn't matter to 31% of the "light" users, and 14% prefer the present arrangement.

	HEAVY USER TOTAL %	LIGHT USER TOTAL %
ALTERNATIVE TO IMPROVE SERVICES		
2. PROVIDE EXTRA COPIES	20	23
7. PROVIDE ASSISTANCE IN STACKS	12	15
1. PURCHASES OF NEW TITLES	16	14
6. SPEED UP LOAN DESK SERVICE	10	11
3. INCREASE THE REFERENCE STAFF	8	10
8. INCREASE THE HOURS	13	10
5. INCREASE THE HOURS OF SERVICE	10	8
4. INCREASE SHELVING STAFF	8	7
9. OTHER	3	2
TOTAL	100	100
THE 2ND ALTERNATIVE IS		
2. PROVIDE EXTRA COPIES	23	24
1. PURCHASES OF NEW TITLES	17	17
7. PROVIDE ASSISTANCE IN STACKS	12	13
6. SPEED UP LOAN DESK SERVICE	10	13
3. INCREASE THE REFERENCE STAFF	6	9
4. INCREASE SHELVING STAFF	7	8
8. INCREASE THE HOURS FOR STUDY	12	8
5. INCREASE THE HOURS OF SERVICE	10	6
9. OTHER	3	2
TOTAL	100	100
IF PERIODICALS WERE TOGETHER, RESULT		
1. HELPFUL	53	55
3. WOULD NOT MATTER	28	31
2. RATHER KEEP THE PRESENT	19	14
TOTAL	100	100

The selection of the "heavy/light" variable has been used as a means of comparison for this report. There are other factors, for purpose of comparing, that may be of interest. For example, commuters/residents or graduate/undergraduate comparisons may be revealing.

Table 4

Selected questions, sharing a high level interest for all schools, and subject to further analysis than the composite might offer, are assembled in this table by the school the respondent was registered in.

Table 5

The same questions, plus the frequency of visits to the library, distributed by seven cross sectoral arrays including three in residential distribution, two in full time/part time status and two in academic level.

SUMMARY

The User Survey is the first major attempt, in twenty years, to canvas and learn about student attitudes towards library services at New York University. In a general sense, the students were neutral in their regard of the library and receptive to filling out the form. The faculty, however, and again as a generalization, were less than neutral and repeatedly remarked as to how "they hoped this questionnaire would improve conditions" at

the library. It is recommended that a different instrument be designed for the faculty, to investigate the reasons for an attitude that is apparently commonly shared by so diverse a group. With the exception of good service and rapport with individual clientele (the normal practice as shown in this report), it will be difficult to inform the University community about any aspect of library service while the faculty maintains a position of benign indifference.

The Library operates on an assumption of equality for all users, a "first-come-first-served" service commitment. This commitment is generally reflected in the evenness of responses about these services as viewed by the student population. Parenthetically, the same evenness occurs for the students' evaluation of the collection and building activities. All tables, whether observed as Groups, Schools, or the Composite demonstrate the effect of this library service philosophy. The users have responded almost as a common voice.

This is certainly an advantage in those areas where the library is currently performing well. For any segment of service or building use that the Library wishes to examine, either as a response to this survey or for other reasons, it is of equal use to know that, by and large, students share common needs, concerns and attitudes regardless of their origins.

LIBRARY USER SURVEY
Composite Statistics
INSTRUCTIONS TO PARTICIPANTS
April 1976

Please check the appropriate space for each question. We greatly appreciate your cooperation. Thank you.

SCHOOL

513	(1)	Washington Square University College
445	(2)	School of Education, Health, Nursing & Arts Professions
165	(3)	College of Business, Public Administration
154	(4)	School of the Arts
90	(5)	School of Social Work
-	(6)	Graduate Business Administration
116	(7)	Graduate Public Administration
194	(8)	Graduate School of Arts on Science
71	(9)	School of Continuing Education
-	(10)	Law School
1,748		

LEVEL

99	(1)	Ph.D candidate
709	(2)	Master's candidate
704	(3)	Undergraduate-upper level
212	(4)	Undergraduate-lower level
20	(5)	Special
3		Blank

RESIDENCE

196	(1)	On Campus
308	(2)	Off Campus-Greenwich Village
1,233	(3)	Commuter
11		Blank

AGE

1,108	(1)	18-24
377	(2)	25-30
114	(3)	31-35
46	(4)	36-40
70	(5)	40-50
24	(6)	50-60
4	(7)	over 60
5		Blank

SEX

792	(1)	Male
944	(2)	Female
12		Blank

STATUS

1,270	(1)	Full Time
459	(2)	Part Time
19		Blank

FINANCIAL AID

1,020	(1)	None
376	(2)	University Scholarship Asst.
418	(3)	Other Scholarship
57	(4)	Work Study
34		Blank

LIBRARY USER SURVEY

Composite Statistics

1. I visit Bobst Library:

___1) At least once daily
___2) About 3-5 times weekly
___3) About once a week
___4) Two or three times a month
___5) About once a month
___6) Irregularly (less than once a month)

970 | 759 | 20 Blank

2. I do not use Bobst because: (Check more than one if applicable)

194 1) I prefer to buy my own magazines and books
143 2) I prefer to use off-campus libraries
349 3) I don't have enough time to use the library
253 4) It is too difficult to get needed materials from Bobst
187 5) I have no need to use the library for my schoolwork
61 6) I don't like libraries
106 7) Other reasons: (list) _____
866 Blank

3. The average time which I spend at the library on any one visit is:

298 1) less than one hour
712 2) less than two hours
693 3) over two hours
49 Blank

4. My primary purpose for coming to the library is to: (check one)

225 1) Charge/return/renew books
507 2) Study, using my own materials
767 3) Find and use materials for a course, a term paper
343 4) Do research
56 5) Do casual reading
29 6) Listen to music
6 7) Attend class
7 8) Use book locker
43 9) Other (list); _____
47 Blank

5. In addition to the above, I also come to the library to: (check more than one if applicable)

596 1) Charge/return/renew books
478 2) Study, using my own materials
626 3) Find and use materials for a course, a term paper
579 4) Do research
219 5) Do casual reading
79 6) Listen to music
17 7) Attend class
38 8) Use book locker
65 9) Other (list) _____
240 Blank

6. The subject areas I use at Bobst are: (Check each one you use):

281 1) Education
143 2) Social Work
511 3) Humanities
130 4) Music
199 5) Science, pure
359 6) Science, applied (inc. Nursing, Home Econ, Medicine, Technology)
596 7) Social Sciences
146 8) Public Administration
418 9) Psychology
272 10) Business, Economics
233 11) Film, Drama, Cinema
12) Other: 99
82 Blank

7. The subject area most frequently used from the above list is number _____. 1-91, 2-77, 3-225, 4-32, 5-111, 6-202, 7-216, 8-84, 9-115, 10-171, 11-109, 12-57, Blank-285.

8. I use the library for "non-academic" or social reasons (meeting friends)

19 1) on every visit
96 2) on more than 50% of my visits
459 3) on less than 50% of my visits
4) never 1,118
Blank-79

9. I use the following resources while ar the library (check more than one if applicable):

909 1) Periodicals/newspapers
963 2) Reserve books
755 3) Reference collection
1,067 4) Books from general stacks
275 5) Microforms
42 6) Instructional Media Center
140 7) Government Documents
150 8) Music listening
46 9) Other (list)
119 Blank

10. The particular resource which I use most frequently from Question #9 is number: 1-277, 2-334, 3-223, 4-602, 5-29, 6-4, 7-13, 8-33, 9-23, Blank-263.

11. In most instances, my success in finding the information and library materials I need is:

119 1) Excellent (found everything)
778 2) Good (found most things)
508 3) Fair (found some things)
223 4) Poor (found few things)
64 5) The question does not apply to me
70 Blank

12. Books I find in the card catalog are on the shelf

512 1) usually(1)
819 sometimes(2)
266 rarely(3)
146 Blank

13. I ask the librarians for assistance when searching for materials:

227 1) Generally
753 2) Occasionally
494 3) On rare occasions
188 4) Never
88 Blank

14. In most instances, the services I receive from the librarians and library staff is:

285 1) Excellent
833 2) Good
299 3) Fair
62 4) Poor
197 5) The question does not apply
77 Blank

Composite Statistics

15. The following statement best describes my feeling in regard to ability to find materials and to search for information in the rary:

515 1) I am usually able to find what I am searching for without wasting time and effort.
840 2) I am sometimes able to find what I am searching for without wasting time and effort.
295 3) I am rarely able to find what I am searching for without wasting time and effort.
103 Blank

16. In most cases, the physical condition of the library materials I use is:

263 1) Excellent
1,082 2) Good
264 3) Fair
30 4) Poor
40 5) Question does not apply
71 Blank

17. If all the periodicals (excluding science) were brought together in one area, the result would be:

833 1) helpful
264 2) rather keep the present arrangement
453 3) would not matter
199 Blank

18. The library orientation and subject seminars are:

220 1) helpful
125 2) of little use
1,186 3) I am not aware of them
79 4) Other: _____
143 Blank

_____

_____

19. If I had to choose, I would select the following alternative for improving library services

426 1) Increase annual purchases of new volumes
615 2) Provide extra copies of volumes currently held
252 3) Increase the reference staff
221 4) Increase the bookstack shelving staff
276 5) Increase the hours of service
314 6) Speed up loan desk service
376 7) Provide assistance on the book stack floors
348 8) Increase the hours the library is open for study
83 9) Other: _____
189 Blank

_____

_____

20. From the above list, the second most important alternative is number____. 1-238, 2-314, 3-107, 4-110, 5-116, 6-157, 7-170, 8-144, 9-38, Blank-351.

Library User Survey

21. For my particular needs, the present library hours are:

464 1) more than adequate
910 2) adequate
251 3) less than adequate
123 Blank

22. Assuming that Bobst Library was open for the hours shown below, I would probably use the library at the times marked (please use check marks):

		MON.	TUES.	WED.	THURS.	FRI.	SAT.	SUN.	Blank
22.	8-9	146	137	146	131	117	117	107	1,445
23.	9-10	186	158	179	166	138	204	193	1,258
24.	10-11	249	201	230	212	189	311	311	1,055
25.	11-12	244	217	234	223	213	362	386	977
26.	12-1	261	299	262	313	245	395	441	864
27.	1-2	300	367	298	358	272	432	500	780
28.	2-3	325	375	313	365	271	424	507	795
29.	3-4	370	373	348	369	263	387	475	837
30.	4-5	290	333	304	330	248	332	408	963
31.	5-6	282	303	299	286	212	264	323	1,071
32.	6-7	297	298	290	259	217	223	294	1,148
33.	7-8	328	327	324	277	241	217	286	1,156
34.	8-9	361	331	357	335	240	209	278	1,165
35.	9-10	320	302	314	298	219	186	262	1,246
36.	10-11	260	253	251	253	184	159	209	1,323
37.	11-12	202	192	192	197	145	117	164	1,426
38.	12-1	159	147	150	150	113	103	136	1,502

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES

December 7, 1979

REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON LIBRARY SERVICE TO UNDERGRADUATES

Steve Fry
Tom Fry
Lorraine Mathies
Mona McCormick
Jim Runcie
Barbara Silvernail
Lisa Snyder
Ron Watson
Marion Peters (Chair)

	Page
Introduction	1
The Charge	1
The Methodology	1
The Needs	2
The Programs	5
Recommendation I: Study Space	5
Recommendation II: Central Reserve Collection	6
Recommendation III: Orientation and User Instruction	7
Recommendation IV: Reference Service	9
Recommendation V: Stacks	10
Recommendation VI: Signs	11
Recommendation VII: Publicity of Library Services and Resources	12
Recommendation VIII: Equipment and Technology	13
~~The~~ New Structure: The Undergraduate Library Center	~~14~~
~~The~~ Estimates of Resources	~~15~~
Appendices	17
Appendix A: ~~List of Interviews~~/Topics for Discussion Questionnaire	
Appendix B: ~~Summary of Unit Head/Staff Responses~~	
Appendix C: Summary of Student Responses	
~~Appendix D: Reading List~~	
~~Appendix E: ERIC/LISA Computer Search~~	

The Task Force on Library Service to Undergraduates is pleased to submit this report in response to the charge received from the University Librarian in July, 1979.

Introduction

This report should serve as a focus for a continuing discussion on the library's involvement in undergraduate education. The report begins with the charge followed by a brief discussion of the Task Force's methodology. Then the report discusses the library service needs of undergraduates, recommends programs to meet these needs, and proposes a new structure, the Undergraduate Library Center. The report concludes with an estimation of the resources necessary to accomplish the proposed recommendations and the new structure. Appendices follow at the end.

The Charge

After the Chancellor's Conference on Undergraduate Education in the 1980's held May 25-27, 1979, at Lake Arrowhead, the University Librarian charged the Task Force with the following recommendations:

1) Identify the library service needs of the undergraduate community;

2) Delineate the programs by which these needs can best be served;

3) Suggest possible organizational structures to achieve the implementation, operation, and assessment of these programs; and

4) Estimate the resources, at least in kind if not in amount, necessary to accomplish the proposed goals.

The Methodology

The Task Force decided that it would concentrate on identifying the library service needs of the undergraduate community and then would focus on the other three areas of the charge. We decided that we needed information from the following sources: undergraduates, student government leaders, university administrators, departmental chairmen, faculty, deans and directors of related services for undergraduates, and library unit heads and staffs. Because of the predicted increase in the number of older, working, and minority students in the 1980's, we included both the Dean of Continuing Education and the directors of the four ethnic studies centers and the librarians. Persons selected from the above sources received a list of topics for discussion. The follow-up interviews conducted by one or two Task Force members lasted from a half hour to an hour (Appendix A: List of Interviews/Topics for Discussion). In

addition library unit heads and their staffs and ethnic studies centers librarians responded to a questionnaire (Appendix B: Summary of Unit Head/ Staff Responses). Task Force members arranged for follow-up interviews as needed or requested. Almost 800 students from three large undergraduate classes, Chemistry 11CL, Music 132A, and Psychology 10 completed a questionnaire (Appendix C: Summary of Student Responses). Task Force members also read materials listed in Appendix D, but, unfortunately, could give only cursory attention to the references generated by a computer search of the ERIC and LISA databases listed in Appendix E.

The Needs

The individuals contacted by the Task Force gave generously of their time and ideas. It was especially gratifying to have confirmed the premise that an interest in the library is pervasive throughout the campus community. In identifying the library service needs of the undergraduate community, the respondents confirmed and expanded on our own understanding of these needs. While many of their ideas can be gathered together and viewed as coherent areas of interest and significance in relation to undergraduate needs, others could be seen to have a pervasive influence on the library and its relationship with undergraduates. Faculty and administrators vociferously voiced complaints abou the condition of the stacks, particularly in URL. Students were also concerned with the difficulty of finding materials in the stacks. Their anxieties might be modified if they had some basic training or guidance in searching for materials; the complaints of administrators and of the faculty, however, can translate into an attitude of indifference or even hostility if they are not addressed. This indifference can easily be communicated to undergraduates who rely on the faculty for guidance. The needs of a faculty member, if seriously addressed, can result in an attitude which is enthusiastic about the library and its resources and can encourage a fuller utilization of these resources by students.

Less amorphous needs were identified by the Task Force and these can be grouped under six major headings. Undergraduates need: space, library materials, orientation to the campus libraries and their resources, library and bibliographic instruction, information and reference services, and equipment which supports and allows students access to these resources. These needs are not unique to the undergraduate community. Graduates and faculty also need space, guidance, and equipment. The differences are largely a matter of degree. The undergraduate can be expected to have less sophistication in his understanding of library resources than the graduate, therefore his understanding needs to be developed at a more elementary level.

Undergraduates need space in the library. They need space to use library materials; they need space to study for exams; they need space to study with others; and they need space where they can engage in informal discussions. Both administrators and faculty frequently expressed concern that undergraduates often use the library inappropriately as study space and as a convenient social center. We believe that the library should not be the sole supplier of study space on campus, but we recognize that students will use the libraries to accommodate their perceived

needs. The intellectual stimulation sparked by discussion should not be viewed as a violation of the library and its function. Rather, attempts should be made to direct group discussions to areas where they will not interfere with students who are trying to conduct serious research. Also, students frequently commented that they want facilities which are properly maintained, comfortable, and secure.

Like other library users, undergraduates need access to library materials. When they are engaged in research their needs are comparable to the needs of graduates. They need access to specialized reference tools; they need to be able to consult both primary and secondary literature; and they need access to print and non-print materials. These needs can be met by the URL and branch library collections if the students is knowledgeable enough to locate her sources. A substantial proportion of the library materials used by undergraduates. however, is required reading. Sepcific assignments are generated by the faculty and the student comes to the library to find only these materials. When he comes to a reserve desk, an appropriate mechanism for distributing limited amounts of material to large numbers of students, he needs materials which come in a variety of formats: books, articles, textbooks, lecture notes, exam files, audio tapes, slides, audio-visual programs, and microforms. These may have been designated by the faculty member as "required" or "recommended" and should be added to the reserve collection. The library's sensitivity to the inflationary rise in book prices may have been blunted by the sheer repetition of ordering materials whose prices have skyrockted. The pain felt by the library is institutional. The pain felt by the students when faced with thsoe same prices is individual and poignant. With this in mind we were encouraged by administrators and faculty to be sensitive to the problem and to extend the range of materials and number of copies of items which appear on reading lists. In addition to specific course support it is clear that undergraduates need access to materials which could be called, loosely, recreational reading. We are not sure what this is. Surely the collections contain vast amounts of materials which would fit comfortably under the rubric "recreational reading." Surely, too, there are additional materials which may be appropriate for the collection. This suggests a need for undergraduates to have some input into the collection development--perhaps something as simple as publicizing the available Recommendation Form.

Library materials are useful only when the student can find them. UCLA is a large campus and the library resources are scattered. Undergraduates, therefore, need a considerable amount of guidance just to find out where things are. They need additional support in learning how to use the resources when they do find them. The first need, then, is for a comprehensive orientation program which will locate the various libraries on campus, offer a generalized overview

of library policies and procedures, explain elementary searching techniques, and preview the various kinds of user instruction which are available now and will be in the near future. The general orientation needs should be supplemented by current unit-sponsored orientations. In addition, services and resources should be publicized by brochures, newspaper articles, advertisements, and the like.

When the student knows where the library's resources are she now has to learn how to use them. Administrators, faculty and library staff were unanimous in asserting that an undergraduate at UCLA should be able to develop a fairly sophisticated search strategy before his graduation. The needs are fairly elementary at the lower division levels: undergraduates need basic information about the card catalog, about the arrangement of materials, about basic bibliographic resources. As they progress to upper division levels, their needs become more refined and are directed by the demands of their particular specialization. There is concern in the academic community that many students are not developing their skills appropriately and are graduating innocent of the resources around them.

Even if we can respond to the needs for orientation and user-instruction, there will be a continuing, perhaps even more demanding, need for information and reference service. This need will best be answered by personalized service which is carried out on a one-to-one basis by people who are genuinely interested in helping. Students need to know that they will be treated humanely and they will be encouraged to return if they are. All of us have had to respond to questions which are prefaced by "I know this is a dumb question, but..." or the like. We need to create and foster a climate in which the question will still be asked but the preface dropped. Undergraduates need personalized attention when they are dealing with traditional print sources. They will need more assistance as computer and information bases expand and as search techniques become less laborious but more complex. They will need teachers who will teach them beyond what they have already learned.

There are various kinds of equipment which are supportive of the undergraduate's quest for a degree. The following list should be considered suggestive of useful equipment needs: photocopy equipment, microform readers and reader/printers, typewriters, calculators, cassette players, slide viewers, and the like. Equipment should be considered an essential extension of the kinds of materials the library can provide for its patrons.

Projections from demographic data suggest that ethnic minorities will outnumber the present majority in California by 1990. The library should be sensitive to those minorities which will have a claim on its services and will need to examine collection development policies to ensure that relevant materials are added to the collection. The Task Force contacted

the various ethnic centers on campus and learned that these centers are directing their attention to meeting the academic and social needs of their groups. Through their reading rooms, they are also attempting to address some of the library needs of their students. Each of these centers provides an important locus for its students and we feel that the library can cooperate with these centers by offering assistance in handling reserve lists, a service these centers are not designed nor funded for. Informal working relationships have already been established as a result of our contact with these centers.

All in all, the undergraduate does not need to be considered as a separate and exotic species. His library needs may be simpler than those of a scholar who is searching the provenance of a tattered 13th century manuscript or who is gathering the latest research on renal carcinoma, but he is merely on an earlier stage of his search and our help may encourage him along the way.

The Programs

To best serve the undergraduate needs discussed above, the Task Force presents the following recommendations. Recommendations I through IV respond specifically to the library needs of undergraduates as identified by the Task Force. They may be considered separately or as elements of the subsequently proposed new undergraduate library organizational structure. Recommendations V through VIII are broader in scope and affect all library users including undergraduates.

RECOMMENDATION I: STUDY SPACE

A) Responsibility for providing study space on campus should be shared with the appropriate campus offices, e.g., Campus Planning, ASUCLA, student government, and dormitories.

B) A variety of student spaces -- quiet, single carrels and small and large group study rooms for discussion--should be available for undergraduate use. Some study space should be available on a 24 hour basis.

C) Study space within campus libraries should be re-evaluated in terms of availability and general atmosphere--variety of seating, housekeeping, lighting, temperature control, personal security, quality of furnishings, etc.

Twenty thousand undergraduates need an enormous amount of study space. Campus libraries alone can not meet their need. The Task Force believes that the primary responsibility of the campus libraries is to provide space

for the use of library materials. The libraries are already in buildings too small for the size of their collections. Responsibility for space for socializing and for the use of personal materials should be shared with other agencies of the University.

Undergraduate student government leaders continue to demand 24 hour library service. When questioned regarding the need for longer library hours, the student government representative said that the order of need was first for study space, second for reserves, and third for the use of library materials. It is not feasible for campus libraries to assume the cost of staffing and operating libraries for extended hours when the primary need for those hours is for study space and not library services. During Winter and Spring Quarters 1979, College Library offered extended hours of full library service including study space. This recent experiment did not show sufficient use to justify longer hours.

The polling of undergraduates and comments from some library staff revealed a concern for improving the physical environment for studying. The Task Force received complaints about marked, dirty, and uncomfortable furniture, poor lighting and ventilation, too much noise, too much quiet, too much trash, and people exhibiting anti-social behavior in the stacks.

RECOMMENDATION II: CENTRAL RESERVE COLLECTION

A) A central reserve collection should be established for undergraduates, preferably centrally located on campus, to replace College Library's reserve services and most undergraduate reserve services in the branch libraries.

B) The central reserve collection for undergraduates should include required, recommended, and supplementary readings; required textbooks; lecture notes; exam files; problem sets; study guides; and should include a variety of formats, audio-visual materials; audiotapes; slides; and microforms.

C) The central reserve collection should be flexible and responsive to the academic needs of undergraduates as defined by the faculty.

D) The "duplicate copy policy" should not apply to the central reserve collection.

The Task Force incorporated many of the 1975-76 Reserve Committee's recommendations in the above.
Faculty and undergraduates are frequently confused as to which library has what reserve material. Total centralization of this function would eliminate this confusion. Centralization would also allow for more standardized communication between the library and faculty. Processing procedures and loan periods would also be standardized. Transferring the responsibility of servicing undergraduate reserve users to the central reserve collection would allow the branch libraries to concentrate more on reference service to upper division undergraduates, graduate students and faculty. However, the Task Force realizes

that many of the unit heads would prefer to handle some, if not all, of the reserves in their own libraries. A central reserve collection would give them an option when the classes their library supports become too large to be accommodated by their staff and space. Consideration might also be given encouraging ethnic studies center to place materials on reserve in this central collection.

At least one university administrator was surprised that the College Library does not, as a matter of policy, acquire all books required and recommended by faculty for courses. The need to make these materials available to undergraduates is becoming ever more apparent with inflation boosting the average price of a book to $20 or more. Some faculty refrain from creating extensive reading lists for their classes because they do not want their students to be forced to spend so much for their books. Having these materials available in multiple copies in a central location would enable faculty to create through reading lists and give students access to required materials.

The "duplicate collection policy" which required that each title the College Library acquired be elsewhere in the library system should not apply to the central reserve collection. Over the years this policy has resulted in many problems, the most serious of which is the automatic addition of inappropriate titles into the holdings of URL and the branch libraries. The duplicate collection policy is a wasteful policy and is destroying the integrity of the library's collections.

The central reserve collection would be an active working collection dependent on use. At least one copy of each requested item would be acquired by the central reserve collection. More than one copy would be added when the size of the class and/or cost of the item would indicate this to be necessary. Heavy demand would first trigger a shortening of the loan period and then acquisition of more copies. Once the demand ceased, for example after two years without any circulation or after the acquisition of a new edition, the title would be weeded. Titles would also be removed from the collection when faculty communicate their intention to stop use of certain titles. The central reserve collection should also report to the faculty on the actual use of their reserve materials. The installation of an automated circulation system would do much to insure the success of this active and flexible collection.

GRS

The Task Force did not seriously consider a merger of the Graduate Reserve Service and the central reserve collection because its charge was focused on undergraduate library service needs. Assuming the successful operation of this centralized reserve service, incorporation of the Graduate Reserve Service into a mammoth reserve operation would be worth investigating.

RECOMMENDATION III: ORIENTATION AND USER INSTRUCTION

A) The Task Force agrees with the goals of orientation as expressed in the Report of the Library Instruction Task Group to the University Librarian, 1976. These goals focus on physical arrangements, procedures, and services of particular libraries.

B) The library should actively participate in UCLA's Summer Orientation Programs.

C) The library should participate in a self-paced library instruction program directed to lower division students.

D) The library should work with the campus administration and academic departments to develop library instruction programs for upper division students.

E) The library should develop a center and a staff which has the responsibility for implementing and supporting orientation and user instruction programs.

Given the size of the campus and the dispersal of library resources, it is unreasonable to expect entering students to be able to find their way around without guidance. Freshmen responding to our questionnaire frequently expressed surprise at the number of library units and admitted they were not aware that these resources exist. Byron Atkinson, Dean of Students, who is responsible for the organization and functioning of UCLA's Summer Orientation Programs was eager to involve the library with the program and to give the library substantial amounts of time during these sessions to identify the various library resources, outline policies and procedures, explain elementary searching techniques, and preview the kinds of user instruction which are available. As a necessary supplement to orientation programs, we are recommending elsewhere (Recommendation VI) the prominent posting of informational and locational signs. The proposed alliance of the library with the Summer Orientation Program is not intended to modify or eliminate orientation programs which are carried out at the unit level.

A good orientation program will give the student a comprehensive sense of where things are. She needs to build on this base and learn how to use the library's resources. Administrators, faculty, and library staff agreed that the student also needs to learn how to conduct a search of the literature, to use the catalog efficiently, to use periodical indexes and other major reference tools, and to identify the structure of the literature in a given field. A beginning has been made. Students enrolled in English I are required to complete a Library Skills Workbook which gives and elementary introduction to the library and its resources. The problem is that this course reaches only about half of the freshman class. We recommend replacing the library instruction unit in English I with a new, self-paced library instruction program which will reach the entire freshman class. The new program could be linked with English 3, a course which is required of all undergraduate students.

The self-paced instruction program required of all students is appropriate for lower division students and can accommodate most of the elementary information a student needs to cope with the library's resources. As he progresses and defines his major, the student will need specialized instruction in the bibliographic resources relevant to his field. At this level the responsibility for library instruction should be directed by the individual academic departments. This is desirable so that unnecessary duplication of instruction can be avoided and so that the focus of instruction can reflect the needs of the particular academic discipline. Once every six years each department has to participate in a program of evaluation. The department responds to a series of questions directed

by the Committee on Undergraduate Courses and Curricula (CUCC). These questions are designed to evaluate the performance of the department in meeting standards promulgated by the university. The proper mechanism, therefore, for ensuring that the departments are responding to the needs of their upper division majors for library instruction is the questionnaire prepared by the CUCC. Professor John Cauble, Chair of the CUCC, is willing to present to the full committee any proposals advanced by the library which are designed to encourage the implementation of library instruction. Other administrators and faculty have offered their encouragement and support of such an undertaking.

The library should support these orientation and instruction programs by establishing a center, with appropriate staff, which is responsible for implementing and supporting these programs. The staff would prepare materials, brochures, audio-visual programs, and give tours and lectures to support the Orientation Programs. The center would be responsible for developing and administering the self-paced library instruction program for undergraduate students. We envisage setting up a library instruction laboratory to handle the 4000 students each year who would be in the program.

In addition the center would support academic departments in developing library instruction programs for their upper division students. Faculty requests for in-class lectures, specialized bibliographical instruction, and other instruction-related activities would be handled through this center.

Audio-visual materials can and should be more widely used in libraries than they are at present. Such materials are being used to guide students through the intricacies of complex indexes. Audio tours have been developed by the College and University Research Libraries. The innovative use of these instructional methods should be examined by the proposed center and the staff should work on the development of these materials. The center could draw on the technical expertise of the Campus Media Center and could coordinate program development with URL and branch library reference staff.

RECOMMENDATION IV: REFERENCE SERVICE

Ref.→

A) The delegated responsibility for one-to-one reference service and point-of-use instruction for undergraduates as it now exists at College Library should be shifted to the University Research Library and the branch libraries.

B) Reference services at the University Research Library and the branch libraries should be expanded as needed to handle the increased workload.

C) The development of point-of-use instructional programs to assist busy reference staff and provide students with self-service instruction should be a coordinated effort among reference staffs, library instruction laboratory, and Campus Media Center.

D) Active promotion of subsidized computerized reference services for undergraduates, individually or in classes, should continue and be expanded.

The College Library's Reference Department has been noted for its ability to provide one-to-one reference service and personalized point-of-use instruction for undergraduates using the College Library for research materials. However, the limited scope and size of College Library's reference and supporting collections reduces the resources available to the undergraduate student who seeks to satisfy her requirements for library materials at one location. The Task Force feels that undergraduate students doing term papers and research projects should use the resources of the branch libraries and the University Research Library.

One-to-one reference service and point-of-use instruction should still be available to undergraduates when they use URL and the branch libraries. To insure the continued provision of this service, URL and branch library reference departments may need to be expanded. Increased staffing would insure that the branch libraries would not be overwhelmed by an increase in undergraduate use.

The Task Force feels that the increased demand for reference service could also be met in part by a greater reliance on point-of-use programs to provide students with self-service instruction. The Task Force also feels that a coordinated approach to the development of point-of-use programs would be the most efficient use of staff expertise, time, and money. For example, reference staffs in cooperation with the center for library instruction and the Campus Media Center could develop point-of-use slide/tape presentations on the use of the various indexing and abstracting services. Copies would be made of the programs for distribution to libraries housing the particular service.

Undergraduates engaged in doing research projects or writing term papers, as mentioned earlier, use the library similarly to graduate students. This is sufficient justification for extending computerized reference service to them. Already Associate Vice Chancellor Ries has provided funds for computer searches for students enrolled in courses in the 190-199 series. Money has also been allocated to provide computer-produced reading lists for any undergraduate class. The Task Force feels that the university administration should expand its policy of subsidizing computer searches for students.

The increased publicity of services, the orientation program, and the required training in basic library techniques should result in a more sophisticated undergraduate library user. However, just as the faculty now refer students to the Learning Skills Center for tutoring in basic reading, writing, and mathematical skills, reference staffs could encourage students to use the center for library instruction for a refresher on basic library techniques.

RECOMMENDATION V: THE STACKS

A) Books should be frequently shelved and the shelves read to ensure order in the

stacks. If accomplishing this requires more staff and funds, those needs should be provided.

B) Patrons should be better informed about what to do if "the book" is not on the shelf (i.e., checking with circulation, having the book searched or recalled, interlibrary loan if the book is missing, etc.).

C) Reshelving space should be established on each stack range with directions to patrons not to reshelve books.

A very large percentage of the polled groups complained of the "books not being on the shelves" and of the stacks being in disarray. Recommendations regarding the stacks recognize the need for better basic library services to undergraduates and order in the stacks should be the first priority. The Task Force felt that suggestions to close the URL stacks, and at least one suggestion to have a non-circulating collection in URL, were based on a belief that this would straighten up the stacks. The real complaint was disorderly stacks. Keeping the stacks open in URL or any of the branch libraries makes better stack maintenance an imperative.

There were several suggestions that increased staff would solve this problem. A night shelving task force was suggested to service all the libraries and respond to particular trouble spots.

Most users appeared to be unaware of what to do when "the book" was not on the shelf. Signs near the elevator on each floor or in stack areas could provide on-the-spot information.

RECOMMENDATION VI: SIGNS

The quantity and quality of signs within campus libraries should be re-evaluated in terms of usefulness, legibility, attractiveness, visibility, and effectiveness. More signs of high quality are needed to facilitate access to library materials, services, and equipment. Multi-lingual signs should be used.

To many undergraduates "the library" is an intimidating environment--a large, complex maze of unfamiliar and seemingly unrelated parts. Locations of information, reference, and other key service points, are often not clearly marked and not immediately apparent to students entering libraries for the first time. Adding to the confusion is the feeling on the part of many students that they should be able to find their way around the library easily and without assistance; they must somehow be at fault if they cannot. They frequently are embarrassed and hesitant about having to ask for information and guidance. All of the groups contacted by the Task Force, and in particular the Ethnic Study Centers, expressed the need for more and improved location and information signs which enable students and faculty to find library materials and equipment on their own and which would

readily direct them to and encourage them to consult reference and information points when they were in need of assistance from library staff.

RECOMMENDATION VII: PUBLICITY OF LIBRARY SERVICES AND RESOURCES

A) An active program for publicizing the scope of library services and resources should be initiated.

B) Improved communication and increased personal contact between the campus libraries, the faculty, and other campus administrative units should promote mutual cooperation and a greater awareness of the ways in which library resources and services may be used to supplement and enrich the undergraduate curriculum.

A significant number of undergraduates polled by the Task Force felt the libraries did not publicize their services and resources sufficiently. Many stated that they were unaware of the existence or location of many of the campus libraries and were unsure of the best library to consult. Specific suggestions made for increased library publicity included distribution of information about the libraries in the student's registration packets; regular publication of library hours, locations, and services in the Daily Bruin; and additional publication of the specialized reference services available in the libraries.

Also mentioned frequently was the need for the library to take the initiative in promoting greater awareness on the part of the faculty about the library resources and services available to them and their classes. Improved communication and cooperation among the library, the academic departments, and administrative units to promote use of the library's resources would insure that it remains a relevant and integral part of a student's life on campus.

RECOMMENDATION VIII: EQUIPMENT/TECHNOLOGY

A) Library resources should reflect current technology when this technology is an integral part of classroom or laboratory teaching methodology or when it offers improved service to the library user.

B) Library services should be flexible, innovative and alert to the changing technology.

Several currently feasible ideas and many speculative thoughts about the use of new and future technological advancements in libraries were discussed by the Task Force. Innovative use of the computer seems the most practical way to improve services and offer better, broader, and faster access to materials than traditional methods.

Other kinds of technological advancements in library-related equipment and materials which were discussed by the committee focused on the new types of materials in the collection and new types of services for the undergraduate student.

As bibliographic control and access tools become increasingly complex and unwieldy for the undergraduate, the computer can be used to provide not only citations and access points for materials but also the materials themselves. Document retrieval via the computer could provide an alternative to the traditional reserve service. High speed printers could provide hard copy of preprocessed articles or books on demand for reasonable prices. Students would pay set rates for materials on a cost-per-page basis to defray machine, processing (staff) and other internal costs plus royalties for the copyright holders and publishers of the materials.

Just as the library provides rental typewriters for student use, the library could, in the future, provide small word processing computers for rent. Special assignments programmed by professors could be carried out on these units. The floppy discs, hard discs or cassettes for the programs and the assignments would be available on loan from the library, after being prepared either by a professor or by library staff for specific classroom assignments. For example, Professor Richard Lanham, English Department, suggested that computer terminals should be placed in the library for his composition classes.

Non-print media should be available in the library for use by undergraduate students. Video cassette machines can play back lectures, lab demonstrations, theater, dance and musical performances and many other educational programs for specific assignments or for classroom supplementary materials. Slides, printed photographs, engraved or silkscreen prints and other such media can serve the fields of art, architecture, theater arts, and other performing arts with the need for a wide range of visual materials for large sections of students. Laser-operated hologram projectors would make possible the detailed study of three-dimensional objects, including sculptures, musical instruments, and iconography.

With the increased availability and use of microforms in the library, the library should make portable microform readers available to undergraduate students. More and more of the library's collections are acquired in microform. Portable readers could be charged out to students for specific periods of time for special projects, class assignments and educational needs. Microform reader/printers should be available as standard equipment in libraries just as photocopy machines are now.

Document delivery has passed the experimental stage in many specialized libraries across the country. The UCLA Biomedical Library has just initiated a self-funding document delivery program for their busy clients. With careful planning a successful self-funded delivery program would not only save staff and money for other library service, but also would save much wear and tear on the stacks and reduce shelving costs. Phone orders would make these transactions dependent on the fewest number of staff members. The computerized circulation system could be consulted during a phone order to determine the exact status of desired materials.

The actual document delivery could be accomplished 1) by mail; 2) through a drive-up window would make issuing delivered documents easy for students and would save the costs and time of mail; and 3) by truck delivery of materials at preselected points or to the students' dormitory or apartment.

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION (I)

1. What do you see as the role for libraries in undergraduate education?

2. What changes do you foresee in undergraduate enrollment patterns in the next ten years?

3. How might library programs and services respond to these changes?

4. What kind of role do you think the library might play in the following?

   --Core courses
   --Honors program
   --Propaedeutic education
   --Ethnic programs
   --Orientation

5. What would you hope that an undergraduate would know about the organization of information and use of libraries by the time s/he graduates from UCLA?

6. Which kinds of library instruction do you consider useful for undergraduates?

   --Full credit quarter course
   --One hour bibliographic lectures (in class or outside?)
   --Orientation tour
   --A/V self-instruction
   --Other (please explain)

7. What is the ideal library environment for an undergraduate?

8. Do you think the library system should provide a separate library for undergraduates?

9. How should the faculty be involved in book selection for an undergraduate library?

10. With the existence of ethnic study centers on campus, do you feel it is necessary for the library at the undergraduate level to be involved in the acquisition of ethnic materials?
    If yes, what kinds of materials are appropriate or necessary at this level?

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION (II)

1. Description of your operation's activities in relation to the university's undergraduate community.

   a) What materials do you purchase for undergraduate use?
   b) What facilities do you have for undergraduate use?
   c) What equipment do you have for undergraduate use?
   d) What materials do you loan to undergraduates?
   e) How do undergraduates gain access to materials in your collection or to services offered by your operation?
   f) What kinds of instruction do you offer for the use of materials? facilities? equipment?
   g) How does your staff assist undergraduates?

2. Quantitative description of your operation if statistics are available, e.g. number of items loaned to undergraduates; size of collection

3. What do you see as the role for your operation in undergraduate education?

4. What changes do you foresee in undergraduate enrollment patterns in the next ten years?

5. How will your operation's programs and services respond to these changes?

6. What kind of role do you think your operation might play in the following?
   - Core courses
   - Honors program
   - Propaedeutic education
   - Ethnic programs
   - Orientation

7. What is the ideal library environment for an undergraduate?

8. Do you think the library system should provide a separate library for undergraduates?

_____

Name of library or unit

TASK FORCE ON LIBRARY SERVICE TO UNDERGRADUATES: QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Please supply the following quantitative data for 1978/79 if available for your unit.

_____ number of items circulated to undergraduates

_____ total circulation

_____ number of reference & information questions asked by undergraduates

_____ total reference & information questions

_____ number of computer searches performed for undergraduates

_____ total computer searches

_____ number of reserve lists received for undergraduate courses

_____ total reserve lists

_____ number of reserve lists referred from other units for undergraduate courses

_____ total reserve lists referred from other units

_____ number of classroom instruction sessions for undergraduates

_____ total classroom instruction sessions

_____ number of library tours for undergraduates

_____ total library tours

_____ other services for undergraduates

2. Describe briefly in what ways your unit's services to and policies for undergraduates differ from those affecting other members of the university community.

(a) Circulation, e.g., quarter loans for faculty and graduate students only

(b) Reserves, e.g., reserve materials kept for graduate level courses only

(c) Reference & information, computer search subsidies available for graduate students only

(d) Library instruction, e.g., tours for graduate students only

(e) Collection, e.g., materials purchased for graduate and research level only

(f) Access to library's resources, e.g., undergraduates admitted by permission of instructor only

(g) Facilities, e.g., use of carrels restricted to graduate students and faculty only

(h) Equipment, e.g., A/V support provided for undergraduate courses only

3. Are these services to or policies for undergraduates described in question #2 provided as part of your unit's daily operation or are they added on an ad-hoc basis as needed?

4. How could these services and/or responsibilities be regrouped or modified to better meet the needs of undergraduates?

5. In providing service to undergraduates do you coordinate your unit's program with other library units, e.g. College Library's reserve program? ____ Yes ____ No

(a) If "yes", please explain.

5. (b) Is this arrangement satisfactory? ____ Yes ____ No
If "no", please explain.

6. The underlying philosophy of undergraduate libraries is that undergraduate students have abilities, needs, and preferences in using libraries that differ from those of the rest of the university community. Do you agree with this philosophy? ____ Yes ____ No

(a) If "yes", please identify some of the unique needs of undergraduates.

(b) If "no", please explain.

7. Do undergraduates at UCLA need a separate library? ____ Yes ____ No

(a) If "yes", what services should an undergraduate library provide? Please explain.

(b) If "no", how should the library needs of undergraduates be met? Please explain.

8. What would you hope that an undergraduate would know about the organization of information and use of libraries by the time they graduate from UCLA?

9. What do you think undergraduates of the future will need/want as library services while they attend UCLA?

10. Please check the categories of materials included in your unit's collection.

_____ printed materials	_____ graphics
_____ audio-visuals	_____ computer-accessed information
_____ sound recordings	_____ cartographic materials
_____ microforms	_____ other

Appendix C: Summary of Student Responses

The Task Force on Library Service to Undergraduates distributed a questionnaire to three large undergraduate classes. The basis for the questionnaire was a similar "Questionnaire on Library Use" distributed in the late 50's. Norah Jones reported the results of thsi previous questionnaire in Books are being read (UCLA Library, Occasional paper, no. 8). A subsequent, expanded questionnaire was also distributed in the late 60's. However, the results were never published.

Our time constraints did not allow for a statistically reliable random sample. Instead, a practical, efficient attempt was made to get the opinions of undergraduates in diverse fields of study. To cover the humanities, social sciences and natural sciences, we selected Professor Tanner's Music 132A, Dr. Parasuraman's Psychology 10, and Chemistry 11CL coordinated by Arlene Russell. The questionnaire was handed out at the beginning of a class period with an introduction from the instructor and collected at the end of the session. The results were tabulated manually and a final summary follows. Normally, no count was made when the question was left blank, therefore the numbers do not add up to consistent totals.

Personal Information

a) 303 Freshman, 181 Sophomore, 100 Junior, 190 Senior, 5 NA

b) 384 Male, 333 Female, 17 NA

c) 715 Single, 20 Married, 41 NA

d) Age: 35 Under 18, 604 18-21, 99 22-25, 8 26-30, 7 31-, 14 NA

e) Ethnic Background (optional): 38 Afro-American, 5 American Indian, 439 Caucasian, 81 Other, 47 Hispanic, 161 Oriental

f) What is your major field of study? 155 Humanities; 192 Social sciences; 283 Sciences; 145 NA

g) Do you live in the Dorms? 254 Yes 420 No 3 NA

h) If not, do you live within walking distance of UCLA? 328 Yes 355 No 89 NA

---

1) How often do you use any of the UCLA libraries?

67 Have never used, 42 Once a quarter, 97 Twice a month, 96 Twice a week, 4 NA
29 Once a year, 59 Once a month, 135 Once a week, 223 More often

2) When do you use the UCLA libraries? (Check more than one if applicable)

381 First half of quarter, 372 At finals, 23 NA
510 Second half of quarter, 69 Between quarters

3) Why do you use the UCLA libraries (Check more than one if applicable)

519 To consult library materials, 729 As study space, 11 NA
449 To borrow library material, 106 For information and assistance from library staf

4) Put a single checkmark beside the UCLA libraries and services which you have used, and two checkmarks beside those you use regularly:

		POWELL LIBRARY BUILDING (central campus)		UNIVERSITY RESEARCH LIBRARY (north campus)		
✓	✓✓	College Library Stacks	156	58	Loan Desk and Stacks	
69	110	College Library Reference Service	155	48	Reference Service	101 11 Oriental
248	60	College Library Reserve Service	183	53	Periodicals Room	70 9 Theater Arts
192	89	College Library Audio/Visual Service	36	12	Graduate Reserve Service	85 11 Micro form
188	58	Education/Psychology	220	87	Card Catalog Information Service	
155	37	Newspaper Stacks	77	22	Public Affairs Service	157 1 NA
158	56	Reading Rooms	81	19	Special Collections	
259	249					

OTHER CAMPUS LIBRARIES: ✓ 35, ✓✓ 4 Architecture/Urban Planning 71 30 Art 165 86 Biomedical
99 28 Chemistry 106 41 Engineering/Math Sciences 32 13 English 47 15 Geology
79 24 Graduate School of Management 89 22 Law 33 8 Map 84 21 Physics
7 2 University Elementary School 69 20 Music 274 0 NA

5) In using the UCLA libraries, do you usually find

SERVICE to be 301 good 397 satisfactory 47 poor 30 NA

Comment:

LENDING POLICIES to be 276 good 394 satisfactory 19 poor 81 NA

Comment:

THE BOOK COLLECTIONS to be 386 good 271 satisfactory 24 poor 94 NA

Comment:

STUDY FACILITIES to be 319 good 345 satisfactory 56 poor 42 NA

Comment:

HOURS to be 569 convenient 110 inconvenient 83 NA

Comment

OVER

6) Where do you do most of your studying? 230 In the Library

7) Last quarter, how many books and other materials do you estimate you borrowed from the UCLA libraries for assigned reading _____ to read for your own pleasure _____ for research (term papers, etc) _____

#7 not tallied

8) Do the UCLA libraries generally have available the books and other materials you want to read

for study	515	Yes	57	No	154 NA
for pleasure	418	Yes	73	No	239 NA

9) What sources have you found helpful in assisting you to use libraries? (Check any that apply)

- 174 UCLA Library Guide
- 55 UCLA library tours
- 321 UCLA library staff (individual help)
- 256 Fellow students
- Other (please specify): _____
- 58 UCLA Library Skills Program/English I
- 92 Public library staff
- 57 Other college or high school library staff
- 42 High school course
- 22 UCLA lecture or course/What course: _____
- 166 None

10) Do you feel that further guidance in library use would help you? 308 Yes 285 No 154 NA
If "yes" which of the following would be useful to you? (Check as many as desired)

- 104 Library tours
- 80 Library lectures
- 208 Term paper clinics
- 135 Handbooks or pamphlets
- 109 Organized course
- 81 Self-paced library skills course
- 265 More instructional and directional signs
- Other (please specify): _____ 99 NA

11) Place a checkmark by each of the following library services which are important to you:

- 232 Audio/Visual
- 59 Computer Reference Service
- 190 Conference Rooms
- 81 Inter Library Loan
- 141 Library use instruction
- 107 Microforms
- 277 Periodicals
- 147 Recreational listening
- 189 Recreational reading
- 93 Recreational viewing
- 216 Reference Service
- 361 Research Materials
- 217 Reserve Materials
- 441 Study Space
- Other (please specify): _____
- 144 NA

12) Do you think there should be a separate library for Undergraduates at UCLA? 243 Yes 400 N
130 NA

13) What library services not already mentioned would you like to see in the future?

14) PLEASE ADD ANY FURTHER COMMENTS YOU MAY WISH TO MAKE ON THE UCLA LIBRARIES AND THEIR SERVICES (Use additional sheets as necessary):

Emory University
May 1980

GENERAL LIBRARIES SURVEY

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE - SOCIAL SCIENCE

1. How many different courses do you teach each year?

   Number of graduate courses _____

   Number of undergraduate courses _____

2. Do you assign projects such as research exercises, papers, take home final examinations which require students to use the Library?

   In graduate courses Yes _____ No _____

   In undergraduate courses Yes _____ No _____

3. Do you tell your students about indexes, abstracts, catalogs, and computerized data bases in your field?

   Yes _____ No _____

4. Have you asked a librarian to come to your classes and explain library resources to your students? Yes _____ No _____

   If "yes", was this useful? Yes _____ No _____

5. Do you expect your students to consult with a reference librarian for: (Please check)

   _____ Identifying appropriate reference tools

   _____ Compiling a bibliography

   _____ Verifying a citation

   _____ Obtaining answers to factual questions

   _____ Other (specify)_____

6. Which of the following library services would you select for increasing student knowledge of library resources and services? (You may check more than one)

_____ A series of voluntary orientation lectures available on a weekly basis

_____ Scheduled lectures in the library on the bibliographies of specific disciplines

_____ Librarians giving classroom demonstrations to assist in specific student assignments

_____ Students doing prearranged library exercises developed by a faculty member and a librarian

_____ Librarians work with individual students on their particular projects

_____ Pocket cassette tours of the library available at the circulation desk

_____ Written guides on how to use the library available at a central location

7. Is the library collection of journals and books adequate for: (Check if yes)

_____ Undergraduate projects

_____ Graduate projects

_____ Your teaching preparation

_____ Your research

_____ Keeping up with current events

_____ Recreational reading

Comments _____

_____

8. Is the physical organization of books and journals adequate for: (Check if yes)

_____ Undergraduate projects
_____ Graduate projects
_____ Your teaching preparation
_____ Your research
_____ Keeping up with current events
_____ Recreational reading

Comments _____

_____

_____

9. What types of materials do you need beyond journals and books?

_____ Audiovisual materials
_____ Census tapes
_____ Public opinion polls
_____ Government documents
_____ Maps
_____ Election data
_____ Corporate financial data
_____ Newspapers
_____ Technical report literature
_____ Other (specify) _____
_____ Other (specify) _____

10. What types of information do you need for your teaching and your research?

_____ Current research results
_____ Research reviews
_____ Numerical data
_____ Other (specify) _____
_____ Other (specify) _____
_____ Previous research results
_____ Research methods
_____ Current events

11. Please indicate (with a check) the following library services that you have used and whether you have found or would find them useful.

Services	Used	Useful
. Computer searching (e.g. Psych. Abstracts)		
. Assistance with preparation of a bibliography		
. Answers to questions		
. Government document use		
. Inter-Library Loan		
. Special collections consultation		
. Copy service		
. Audiovisuals		
. Reserve		
. Location of materials not on the shelf		
. Other		

Comments on service _____

_____

_____

_____

12. Would you like a service which selected relevant current citations based on your individual interest profile for: (Check if yes)

_____ Teaching preparation _____ Research

13. Would you like a service which selected relevant citations from previous research or review journals on a selected topic for: (Check if yes)

_____ Teaching preparation _____ Research

14. Would you like a service which would search numerical data bases for: (Check if yes)

_____ Teaching preparation _____ Research

15. Would you like a pickup and delivery service for books, Xerox copies, etc?

Yes _____ No _____

Comments _____

_____

16. Would you like to have a librarian assist you in: (Check if yes)

_____ Preparing reading lists for your classes

_____ Identifying call numbers for reserve materials

17. Would you like to be informed about new capabilities the library has or develops which may be relevant to your courses or your research? (Check if yes)

_____ New on-line data bases _____ Reprint ordering

_____ Reference consultations _____ Tailored bibliographies

18. Would you like to have a separate area in the library for: (Check if yes)

_____ All new books

_____ New recreational reading

_____ Materials related to current campus events

_____ Other (specify) _____

_____

19. Would you like a list of the serials paid for by your department?

Yes _____ No _____

20. Do you feel that the library should have subject specialists to assist the faculty in the selection of materials for the collection in your areas?

Yes _____ No _____

Comments _____

_____

21. Would you like to have an automated Union Catalog of the books held by other local libraries? Yes _____ No _____

Comments _____

_____

22. Should Emory participate in cooperative acquisitions with other schools in the area? Yes _____ No _____

Comments _____

_____

23. Do you feel that undergraduates should have a separate library?

Yes _____ No _____

Comments _____

_____

24. Should graduate reserve materials be located in Candler or in Woodruff?

_____ Candler _____ Woodruff

Comments _____

_____

25. Would you like to know when journals have been sent to the bindery?

Yes _____ No _____

Comments _____

_____

26. Are the book and journal check-out procedures a problem for you?

Yes _____ No _____

Comments _____

_____

FQ-SS

27. Do you use the library as a place to work?

Yes _____ No _____

If "yes, is it effective for your purposes? Yes _____ No _____

Comments _____

_____

28. Do you think that special materials on campus such as art slides or data tapes should be brought under some central control?

Yes _____ No _____

Comments _____

_____

29. Do you have any suggestions on how the library could more effectively meet the needs of faculty and students? _____

_____

_____

_____

Name: _____
(optional)

Department: _____

Please use the enclosed pre-addressed envelope for return by campus mail.

5/6/80

Emory University
May 1980

GENERAL LIBRARIES SURVEY

GRADUATE STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Name:_____ (optional) Degree: M.A._____Ph.D._____

Major Area:_____

1. Which libraries do you use? (Please check)

_____ Woodruff _____ Candler

_____ Chemistry _____ Other (specify)_____

2. Listed below are activities which may require the use of the library.

Please check those activities in which you engage.

_____ Class papers

_____ Thesis/dissertation preparation

_____ Teaching preparation

_____ Staying current in your field

_____ Keeping up with current events

_____ Recreational reading

3. Is the collection of materials in the library adequate to meet your needs

for: (Check if yes)

_____ Class papers

_____ Thesis/dissertation preparation

_____ Teaching preparation

_____ Staying current in your field

_____ Keeping up with current events

_____ Recreational reading

In what areas could the collection be improved?_____

_____

_____

4. Is the physical organization of the collection adequate to meet your needs for: (Check if yes)

_____ Class papers

_____ Thesis/dissertation preparation

_____ Teaching preparation

_____ Staying current in your field

_____ Keeping up with current events

_____ Recreational reading

How could the organization be improved? _____

_____

_____

5. What types of material do you need in your work?

_____ Books

_____ Manuscripts

_____ Preprints

_____ Government documents

_____ Computer tapes

_____ Newspapers

_____ Journals

_____ Dissertations

_____ Microforms

_____ News magazines

_____ Reference material (e.g. indexes, abstracts)

_____ Audiovisuals

_____ Other (specify)_____

_____ Other (specify)_____

6. Please indicate (with a check) the following library services that you have used and whether you have found them useful.

Services	Used	Useful
. Reference consultation		
. Computer prepared bibliography		
. Government document use		
. Inter-Library Loan		
. Special collections consultation		
. Copy service		
. Audiovisuals		
. Reserve		
. Location of materials not on the shelf		
. Other		

Comments_____

_____

_____

7. Would you like to have a book and photocopy delivery service between the libraries on campus? Yes_____ No_____

8. Would you like to have a separate area in the library for: (Check if yes)

_____ All new books

_____ New recreational reading

_____ Materials related to current campus events

_____ Other (specify)_____

_____

9. Do you use a study or a carrel? Study _____ Carrel _____

10. Do you find the library an environment conducive for study?

Yes_____ No_____

Suggestions_____

_____

11. Are the library hours adequate for your purposes? Yes_____ No_____

Suggestions_____

_____

_____

12. Are the book and periodical circulation periods adequate for your needs?

Yes_____ No_____

Suggestions_____

_____

13. Are the book and journal check-out procedures a problem for you?

Yes_____ No_____

Suggestions_____

_____

14. Do you have trouble finding your way around the Woodruff Library?

Yes_____ No_____

Suggestions_____

_____

15. Do you feel that undergraduates should have a separate library?

Yes_____ No_____ No Opinion_____

Comments_____

_____

_____

16. Should graduate reserve materials be in Candler, in Woodruff, or in Chemistry? _____ Candler _____ Woodruff _____ Chemistry

17. Would you like to know what books or journals are available at local libraries? Yes_____ No_____

18. Would you like to know when journals have been sent to the bindery?

Yes_____ No_____

19. Which of the following library services would you select for increasing student knowledge of library resources? (You may check more than one)

_____ A series of voluntary orientation lectures available on a weekly basis

_____ Scheduled lectures in the library on the bibliographies of specific disciplines

_____ Librarians giving classroom demonstrations to assist in specific student assignments

_____ Students doing prearranged library exercises developed by a faculty member and a librarian

_____ Librarians work with individual students on their particular projects

_____ Pocket cassette tours of the library available at the circulation desk

_____ Written guides on how to use the library available at a central location

20. Do you have any additional suggestions on how the library could more effectively meet your needs?_____

_____

_____

_____

Please use the enclosed pre-addressed envelope for return by campus mail.

University of Colorado

LS #4 4/20/71

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

(Please fill out and return at exit)

Please check one:

_____ Freshman
_____ Sophomore
_____ Junior
_____ Senior
_____ Graduate
_____ Faculty

Enrolled in:

_____ Professional School
_____ Humanities & Social Science
_____ Sciences

A: How often do you use Norlin:

_____ More than once a week
_____ More than 8 times a semester
_____ A few times
_____ Infrequently or not at all

B: How would you rate these aspects of Norlin: Please do so by marking (A) Excellent, (C) Satisfactory, (F) Poor, against any applicable item below:

_____ Ventilation - temperature - quality of the air
_____ The lighting
_____ The furniture - chairs, tables, carrels
_____ The noise levels
_____ The extent of crowding
_____ The extent of privacy in the reading rooms
_____ The physical quality of the reading room environment

C: If you make infrequent or no use of Norlin, please indicate why by checking the applicable items below:

_____ Use another library on campus
_____ Use libraries off campus
_____ My courses do not require library use
Other, please explain_____
_____
_____

D: If the physical environment in Norlin is a major factor in preventing you from reading there would you please tell us, briefly, why? _____
_____
_____
_____

April 1979

UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO GENERAL LIBRARY

Please help us serve you better by answering the following questions.

I am a

_____Faculty member

_____Staff member

_____Graduate student

_____Other Please describe _____

_____Undergraduate student

_____

Today I came to the library to

_____Borrow or use library materials

_____Return books

_____Study

_____Tour the library or receive formal instruction

_____Meet someone

Today I used the following library materials/services:

_____Reserve books

_____Microforms

_____Newspapers or periodicals

_____A card catalog

_____Specific single books

_____Help from librarians

_____Government documents

_____Interlibrary loans

_____Audio-visual materials and services

_____Microfiche serials list

_____Photocopy service

_____Other

_____Reference books or indexes

My success in finding library materials is:

_____Excellent

_____Good

_____Fair

_____Poor

_____The question doesn't apply

My success in obtaining help from library staff is

_____Excellent

_____Good

_____Fair

_____Poor

_____The question doesn't apply

My professors (if a student) encourage use of the library.

Yes _____ No _____

Is the library open enough hours to suit you?

Yes _____ No _____

The Library was a pleasant place to use today.

Yes _____ No _____

Please return to the circulation desk.

77

4/16/79 ASC

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR LIBRARY USERS

COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR LIBRARY USERS

The Libraries are cooperating with the Faculty Library Expansion Task Force appointed by President Chamberlain in the gathering of views and opinions from student users of the Library. This information will be used by the Task Force, the Libraries Staff, and the University administration to plan additional library space which best meets the needs of all library users. We appreciate your taking the time to answer the following questions.

1. Do you have difficulty in finding a place to study in the Library?

   (a) Never 220 (12%) (b) Rarely 491 (26%) (c) Occasionally 917 (43%) 1880
   (d) Often 315 (17%) (e) No opinion 37 (2%)

2. Are you disturbed by noise in the stack and study areas?

   (a) Never 155 (8%) (b) Rarely 524 (28%) (c) Occasionally 692 (37%) 1865
   (d) Often 480 (26%) (e) No opinion 24 (1%)

3. Do you consider any of the following to be a hindrance to studying in the library?

   (a) Temperature 1,128 (44%) (b) Noise level 677 (27%) (c) Insufficient lighting 235 (9%) 2539
   (d) Lack of seating space 484 (19%) (g) No opinion 1 (h) No information 14

4. Is additional study space needed in the library?

   (a) Yes 1,208 (66%) (b) No 394 (22%) (c) No opinion 135 (7%) (d) No information 93 (5%) 1830

5. If your answer to the previous question was "yes", which of the following types do you prefer?

   (a) Lounge seating 301 (19%) (b) Large study tables 594 (38%) (c) Individual carrels 532 (34%) (d) Other (please specify) 68 (4%) 1546
   (e) No opinion 43 (2%) (f) No information 8

6. Do you find sufficient space for your personal belongings (books, backpacks, coats, etc.)?

   (a) Never 82 (4%) (b) Rarely 109 (6%) (c) Occasionally 145 (8%) 1748
   (d) Often 1,311 (75%) (e) No opinion 80 (4%) (f) No information 41 (2%)

7. How important to your research needs is a centralized location for current periodicals?

   (a) Very important 732 (40%) (b) Moderately important 656 (36%) 1845
   (c) Of little importance 319 (17%) (d) No opinion 87 (5%) (e) No information 51 (3%)

8. In using the library collection, which of the following would you prefer:

   (a) Periodicals with books on the same shelves (present arrangement)? 524 (32%)

   (b) Periodicals separated from books into two different areas on each floor? 294 (18%)

   (c) Periodicals separated from books and located on one floor? 681 (42%)

   (d) No opinion 138 (8%) 1637

9. If you use the General Reference or Science Reference areas, have you encountered the following:

   (a) Lack of table space to use reference materials? Yes 754 (41%) No 582 (31%)
   No opinion 512 (28%) 1848

   (b) Unacceptable noise level? Yes 535 (29%) No 761 (42%) No opinion 524 (29%) 1820

   (c) Inadequate lighting? Yes 294 (16%) No 1,026 (56%) No opinion 506 (28%) 1826

   (d) Uncertainty regarding arrangement of materials? Yes 1038 (72%) No 396 (28%)
   No opinion 1434

   (e) Crowding of materials on shelves? Yes 531 (30%) No 809 (45%)
   No opinion 453 (25%) 1793

   (f) Locating reference librarians? Yes 393 (25%) No 737 (47%) No opinion 424 (27%) 1554

10. At present the library collection is divided into subject areas, with the Social Sciences materials on the lower level, the Humanities collection on the main level, and the Sciences on the 2nd and 3rd levels. To serve the reference needs of patrons there is presently a General Reference desk on the main level and a Science Reference desk on the 2nd level. Is there also a need for a separate Social Science Reference desk on the lower level?

(a) Yes 401 (23%) (b) No 503 (37%) (c) No opinion 465 (34%) 1369

11. Is the centralization of circulation services (having the Loan and Reserve desks in the same location) desirable? 1612

(a) Very desirable 534 (33%) (b) Moderately desirable 510 (32%)
(c) Not desirable 367 (23%) (d) No opinion 137 (9%) (e) No information 64 (4%)

12. To what extent would your work be adversely affected if the items which have not been used in the last five or more years were stored in an off-campus building from which they could be retrieved on demand in no more than 48 hours and usually in 24 hours?

(a) Greatly 350 (20%) (b) Moderately 637 (37%) (c) Barely 475 (28%) (d) Not at all 155 (9%) (e) No opinion 63 (4%) (f) No information 41 (2%) 1721

13. To what extent would your work be adversely affected if the items which have not been used in the last five or more years were housed in an addition to the Morgan Library in compact storage with immediate retrieval on demand?

(a) Greatly 84 (4%) (b) Moderately 272 (14%) (c) Barely 456 (24%)
(d) Not at all 836 (44%) (e) No opinion 237 (12%) (f) No information 36 (2%) 1921

Class (Fr., Sr., Jr., Sr., Grad.) _____ College _____

PLEASE DEPOSIT COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE SPECIALLY MARKED BOXES AT EITHER REFERENCE DESK, OR AT THE LOAN OR RESERVE DESKS

Thank you for your cooperation!

Distribution of Responses

By Colleges

Agriculgure	128 (6%)
Business	293 (15%)
Forestry	253 (13%)
Professional Studies	81 (4%)
Vet Med. & Biomed	119 (6%)
Arts, Humanities, & Social Sciences	361 (19%)
Engineering	169 (9%)
Home Economics	141 (7%)
Natural Sciences	249 (13%)
No College	110 (6%)
TOTAL	1904

By Class Rank

Graduates	848	Responses	= 45%
Seniors	330	"	= 17%
Juniors	248	"	= 13%
Sophomores	168	"	= 9%
Freshmen	116	"	= 6%
No Rank	196		= 1%
TOTAL	1906		

USER SURVEYS ON SPECIFIC ISSUES

AVAILABILITY ANALYSIS REPORT

July 1980

Elliot S. Palais

The Availability Analysis is a study of patrons' success or failure to locate desired books in the ASU Library during two test periods: the interim between the Spring and Summer Session and the first Summer Session, 1980. Library users who approached the public catalog were asked to record the titles of books they came to find and to indicate whether or not they found them. Temporary staff members searched for all of the books that were not found to determine the reason for failure, which they recorded on forms based on material supplied by the Association for Research Libraries. The forms and instructions for the analysis are included in the most recent edition of the Collection Analysis Project Manual, and were not available at the time ASU participated in CAP. In a sense, this report is part of our involvement with the ARL Collection Analysis Project. In addition, this report employs methodology tested by P.B. Kantor (1976) and T. Saracevic et al. (1977).

The possibilities for failure to locate books may be arranged into five major categories, each involving one or more factors:

(1) the library does not own the book (Acquisitions Performance).

(2) the book was in circulation to someone else (Circulation Performance).

(3) the book was either misshelved or unlocatable on the day of the search (Library Performance).

(4) the patron either missed the title in the public catalog, wrote the call number incorrectly or failed to consult the OCLC operator (Catalog User Performance).

(5) the book was on the shelf in the correct place but the user did not find it (User Performance).

Performance figures were calculated for both of the periods studied, but a statistical test applied by Jan Loechell, who contributed a great deal to this analysis, indicated that there was no significant difference between them. Accordingly, the figures that follow are a combined total of the entire test period.

REASONS FOR FAILURE	NUMBER OF BOOKS	MEASURE OF AVAILABILITY
1. Acquisitions Performance	54	94.5%
2. Circulation Performance	68	92.2%
3. Library Operations		85.7%
Misshelved	9	
Unlocatable	105	
4. Catalog User Performance		93.1%
Missed in catalog	6	
Wrong call number	48	
Failed to use OCLC	9	
5. User Performance		86.9%
Book on shelf	53	
Book located in special location indicated on card	8	
Book located in special location identified on circulation printout	28	
	388 failures	

Of a total sample of 1097 books, 662 were immediately available to users, 388 were not found, and 47 were unusable (illegible). Our overall success rate, that is, the percentage of books immediately available, was 60.4% for the total study period. (It rose to 61.5% during the Summer Session). The Measure of Availability is a statement of probability. At ASU, the probability that a book will not be in circulation is 92.2%; the probability that a book will not be misshelved or otherwise unlocatable is 85.7%.

The value of availability analysis is the identification of specific reasons for failure to locate the books. The figures presented in the table may also be stated as follows:

5.5% of the books patrons want are not owned by the library.

7.8% of the books people look for are checked out by someone else.

14.3% of the books are owned by the library but are not on the shelves where they should be.

6.9% of the time the patron lacks the required skill in catalog use.

13.1% of the time the book is where it belongs, but the patron lacks the skill to find it.

The bottom line of this analysis is that the patron will leave the library without four of every ten books he came to find, because of a combination of these factors.

COMPARISON WITH OTHER LIBRARIES

Is this level of performance good or bad? We can get some conception of our success from the comment of P. B. Kantor, who originated this type of analysis. Kantor stated that a typical large university library will have an availability (success) rate of 57%. The only published figures available for comparison are these:

University of Tennessee Undergraduate Library	53.8%
University of Minnesota Bio-Medical Library	63.%
Case Western Reserve - Sears Library (Science)	56%
Case Western Reserve Freiberger Library (Arts, Social Sciences)	64%
University of Michigan Medical Library	52%
University of Michigan Undergraduate Library	62%
Average	58.5%
Arizona State University	60.4%

Although ASU's rate is above average, some large libraries are doing better and we have no reason for complacency. An examination of each of the measures of availability should help both to explain the degree of success so far attained, and more important, the action required to improve.

ACQUISITIONS PERFORMANCE

An Acquisitions Performance rate of 94.5% is one of the highest so far reported, although figures of 90% or higher are quite common. It is apparent that acquisitions policies and procedures are working rather well. Nevertheless, it is possible that the articulation of the collection policy now in progress may result in even better alignment of user needs and actual purchases.

CIRCULATION PERFORMANCE

Circulation Performance depends on both the length of the loan period and the provision of added copies of high demand titles. Performance can be improved either by shortening the loan period, by added copies, or by a combination of both methods. Our comparatively high circulation performance (92.2%) can be attributed to our short loan policy (for undergraduates) and

to our rather strict enforcement of faculty and staff borrowing regulations. The present performance level can be maintained only if these policies are continued.

The effect of purchasing added copies can be estimated by the analysis performed on the books that were located by the patrons. Of these, 27.6% were held in two or more copies. If we were to assume that patrons were successful in finding these books only because there were multiple copies in the collection, then the absence of these added copies would result in a drop in the overall success rate from 60.4% to a disastrous 45.2%. Of course, as our own studies have indicated, not all of our added copies are in circulation all of the time. Some of these titles would undoubtedly have been found on the shelves even if we did not purchase added copies. Nevertheless, because of demonstrated persistence of heavy demand for 78 to 93% of these high circulation titles, it can be assumed that the number of failures would have increased substantially without the added copies, perhaps enough to lower the overall rate by 8 or 10%. The purchase of added copies of high demand titles has been a significant factor in maintaining our success rate. This program should be continued in order to maintain or improve the rate. In addition, we should explore the possibility of a variable loan period, so that titles temporarily in demand could circulate for one week. Should demand persist, an added copy could then be purchased.

LIBRARY OPERATIONS PERFORMANCE

Our performance in this area of 85.7% is typical of figures reported by other libraries. Although it is our area of poorest performance, we have already taken some action that should result in improvement. The exit control system should reduce loss due to theft. Moreover, the library administration has already taken measures to prevent backlogs in reshelving

and to keep the stacks in good order. It is suggested that the condition of the stacks be frequently monitored, that shelf-reading be done at regular intervals, and that the inventory be continued. The latter program was particularly useful in identifying needed replacements and in withdrawing records for titles no longer held. An open stack library serving a user population as large as this one does requires a generous amount of labor to maintain its usefulness. Any attempt to cut labor costs in this area will inevitably result in an even lower success rate.

USER PERFORMANCE (including catalog use)

Although the ARL statistical form analyzes catalog use separately from user performance at the shelf, the two are often combined because they both describe the user's lack of library skills. If we average the 93.1% reported for catalog use and the 86.9% for user performance in locating books, we find that user performance in general is 90% at ASU. It is interesting to note that few patrons missed the title in the public catalog, that is, most of them were not confused by forms of entry or by filing rules. The errors were easily correctible ones, generally involving carelessness or failure to note a special location, such as Architecture. Many patrons do not know how to find books in the stacks and would benefit from some simple instruction. Moreoever, many failures are caused by lack of information about the daily circulation printout, which identifies not only books that are out (and locatable if one knows about "hold" requests), but also those on Reserve and readily available for use.

These facts about user performance suggest that considerable improvement in performance could be achieved by a program to enhance user skills. This program could take two forms:

(1) Signs. Some highly visable signs could alert users to commonly committed errors in writing call numbers, particularly in noting special locations. Signs at the circulation desk might encourage readers to ask about books they could not find. Information desk personnel could assist in verifying call numbers and helping patrons use the circulation printout if patrons are regularly referred to them.

(2) User Instruction Program. All orientations should devote some time to the identification of common errors and to basic information on locating books, including use of the circulation printout. Small groups should benefit by demonstrations of book location in the stacks. An additional program might work as follows: patrons who cannot locate books should be encouraged (both orally and by signs) to initiate search requests, even if this is their first attempt to locate the book. Searches should be done quickly, either the same day or the next, and if the book is found correctly shelved on the first search, the patron should receive an additional message with the usual card informing him that the book was located. The message would read as follows: "Library staff members located this book soon after you reported it missing. If you think you need help in learning how to find books in the stacks, you are invited to a brief training session to be held ..." Such sessions might be scheduled every two weeks and would cover precisely those things that are causing patrons to miss the books they want, that is, writing numbers correctly, reading them properly, locating books in the stacks, etc. Because the mistakes are simple ones, they should be easy to correct and the sessions could be as brief as half an hour.

HOW MUCH IMPROVEMENT IS POSSIBLE?

The figures presented below reinforce the need to pay attention to all of the factors that reduce availability of books. The analysis also demon-

strates the opportunity to concentrate our efforts on those areas where the most improvement can be expected.

As noted below, improving any one factor, even to the 100% level, would still leave the success rate lower than desirable.

If we improved the Acquisitions rate to 100% and changed nothing else, the resulting success rate would be 63.9%.

If we improved Circulation performance to 100%, the rate would be 65.5%.

If we improved Library Operations to 100%, the rate would be 70.5%.

If we improved the Catalog User performance rate to 100%, the rate would be 64.9%.

If we improved the User Performance rate to 100%, the rate would be 69.5%.

If we improved the combined Catalog Use/User Performance rate to 100%, the rate would be 74.4%.

If we improved all factors to 95%, the overall success rate would be 77.4%, which most likely is the best possible rate.

We might set a goal of improving both Library Operations and the combined User Performance rate to 95%, which would produce an overall success rate of 74.7% (the same improvement that would result from a 100% Combined User Performance rate).

SUMMARY and RECOMMENDATIONS

The presence of an extremely large student population engaged in study and research in a broad range of subjects makes a high success rate difficult to maintain. ASU's above average performance is no accident but rather the result of a number of deliberate (and only apparently unrelated) policies that have, in some cases, been in force for five years. These policies are as follows:

(1) The purchase of added copies of high demand titles, based on circulation records.

(2) A partial inventory, which resulted in withdrawal of records for books no longer held and replacement of the most important titles.

(3) A search routine which regularly performs the same functions, that is, worthwhile in-print books are replaced.

(4) Circulation records are regularly purged of any books charged out for over six months to individuals who can no longer be expected to return them (for example, people who move with no forwarding address). Needed books are then replaced.

(5) Stacks are shelfread whenever possible.

(6) Circulation regulations have been tightened, particularly for faculty loans

(7) Worn-out books are regularly evaluated for replacement and/or withdrawal.

(8) Acquisitions policies and procedures make the purchase of current imprints our first priority (particularly English language titles). Catalog Service makes these available as quickly as possible.

It is readily apparent that no single department in the library is responsible for the availability rate, but rather that it is a cooperative effort of a number of them. Library administrators should be aware of this fact in order to ensure continuance of all of these policies, a necessary condition for the maintenance of a satisfactory availability rate.

We can look forward to some improvement because of the installation of a security system, which should reduce loss due to theft. Further improvement requires the implementation of the following measures:

(1) Immediate reinstatement of the inventory program, which should

remain as a permanent function of the Circulation service.

(2) Install signs designed to improve catalog user performance (perhaps combined with instructions for use of the COM catalog).

(3) Additional signs are needed to encourage readers to ask for assistance in interpreting call numbers and locations and to request searches for books that they still cannot locate after getting such help.

(4) Enhance the user instruction program with simple, but practical guidance in avoiding the most common patron errors. Tie in such a program with the search routine as described in the body of this report.

(5) Maintain full strength in the reshelving unit in order to keep the stacks in good order at all times.

These measures, which are intended to increase the Library Operations and the Combined User Performance rate, could raise our overall success rate to 75%. No library has yet recorded such an achievement, but then, no one has tried it.

REFERENCES

P. B. Kantor, "Availability Analysis," Journal of the American Society for Information Science 27: 311-319 (Sept. 1976).

T. Saracevic, W. M. Shaw and P. B. Kantor, "Causes and Dynamics of User Frustration in an Academic Library," College & Research Libraries 38: 7-18 (Jan, 1977).

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

February 1978

AL REPORT Undergraduate Library Availability Study 1975-1977

by Rita Smith and Warner Granade

As librarians everywhere sit comfortably reading the literature of their profession and reflecting on their library's achievements, the average patron is leaving that library having found only slightly over half the books he or she has sought on the shelf. A frustration that is frequently expressed about libraries is that the books the user needs are not available at the time they are needed.

Daniel Gore (1976) contended in the 27th University of Tennessee Library Lecture that "... a small portion of any library collection is in such heavy demand that the books are often unavailable when wanted -- so often that the average rate of unavailability for all wanted books owned by an academic library appears to be in the range of 50%."

Such assertions have led many librarians to try to determine just how successful their library has been in making materials available for its patrons. The title given to such an investigation is an "availability study," because it seeks to determine to what extent books are available when sought. Gore defined an availability rate as "the percent of wanted books held by the library that are available on your shelves when the patron wants them."

How well does the University of Tennessee Undergraduate Library meet user demands? Does its specialized nature and multiple copy policy assure a greater availability rate than the 50% average that Gore claimed in his lecture? Librarians hope that their library can provide significantly more than 50% of the items sought. But suppose that the unavailability rate does approach 50%. What are the factors that would contribute to such failures? What percent is a result of high demand, library malfunction, and user error? In response to these questions and concerns, the administration of the Undergraduate Library began to investigate the literature to see what other libraries were finding.

A review of the literature from the past ten years, revealed studies involving the investigation of the availability of library materials conducted in both the United States and Great Britain. Many of the investigations have reported 40-50% failure rates among library patrons. Buckland (1975) noted that through attention to availability rates and subsequent measures taken by the University of Lancaster, the library was able to raise the satisfaction rate among its patrons from 60% to 86%. Buckland was particularly interested in changes that could be effected through modified loan and duplication policies.

Urquhart and Schofield (1971, 1972) conducted availability studies from 1968 to 1972 through the Library Management Research Unit at the Cambridge University Library. Reporting on studies in different types of academic libraries, LMRU found that Library A (one library serving an entire academic community) had a failure rate of 49%; Library B (a main library in a system with departmental libraries) had a failure rate of 40%; and Library C (a departmental library serving one faculty) had a failure rate of 39%. Schofield, Cooper, and Waters (1975) reported a failure rate of 44% in the main collection of an academic library that had a circulation period of two weeks. The same library's short loan collection which had a circulation period of four days had a failure rate of 31%. Urquhart and Schofield (1972) contended that the results of an availability study could be used to justify budget requests, to establish priorities for procedural changes, to specify titles and subject areas in great demand, and to suggest patterns of reader behavior.

Intrigued by these British studies and by Trueswell's (1968) work with the characteristics of circulation data, Gore (1975) raised the issue of the availability problem for libraries in the United States. Incredulous of statistics reporting 40-50% failure rates in the library, he conducted an availability study at Macalaster College and was shocked to find a 42% failure rate there. Gore believes that these kinds of statistics expose serious problems for library management and that more attention needs to be directed toward formulation of effective acquisitions and loan policies.

The latest reported study was conducted by Saracevic, Shaw, and Kantor (1977) at Case Western Reserve University. Two surveys were taken, one before and one after a change in the library's circulation policy from semester loan to four week loan. The surveys set out to measure the performance of both the library and the user. In the first study, conducted before the loan period was changed, the failure rate at its peak was 52%. In the second study, after the change, the failure rate at its peak was 44%. The investigators were satisfied that the change in the loan period had improved the performance of the library, while noting that other factors were also involved. User error in both studies was high enough for them to recommend improved graphics and orientation. Due to the high number of missing books, they also recommended an improved security system.

During the Fall Quarter 1975, the Undergraduate Library administration decided to conduct an availability study in the UGL. The purpose of the study was to determine if patrons were finding what they wanted through the card catalog; if there was significant failure locating books on the shelves; and if there were specific titles or general fields of information in high demand. From the information generated by the study, the administration expected an analysis of the reasons for failure to provide needed materials at the catalog and the shelves. Other expected results included assessments of the points of weakness in the collection, of the viability of the circulation period, and of other service activities such as library instruction and patron assistance; and input for a materials selection policy.

When all the data were collected and analyzed, it became obvious that a rate of availability/unavailability could not be calculated. This was due to the construction of the survey form, which allowed for a simple yes or no answer to the questions, "did you find the books you were looking for in the card catalog," and "was the book you wanted on the shelf." The major objective of the study had been to determine the significance of success and failure, and a second study, with a new survey form and a modified methodology, was then initiated to determine a rate of success and failure.

The determination of an availability rate would allow the library administration to know if the books not available were an insignificant proportion of those sought or if they represented a major proportion of those sought and a possible service deficiency. To achieve a rate of availability, the second study required that in addition to the number of titles not found, a measure of the actual number of titles sought should be determined.

The questionnaire design had to be changed to accomplish the latter measure. The original questionnaire required some extra effort on the part of the patron to record information that he might not have ordinarily recorded, such as author and title. No return rate was kept on the first questionnaire,

but estimates placed it at less than 25%. The new design sought to make the questionnaire simple to complete. What evolved was more of a worksheet for the patron to use at the card catalog and placed the burden of effort on the investigators rather than the patrons. The individual library user was merely asked to record the call number from the catalog onto the worksheet instead of his own paper. Beside each block for the call number was a space for the patron to make a check mark for those books he could not find on the shelf.

The revised questionnaire was tested during the late summer of 1976 and then modified somewhat in wording and spacing. Initially, the study intended to determine to what extent materials which were unavailable in the Undergraduate Library could be found in the Main Library. Returned questionnaires had to be processed in both libraries. After two weeks this study proved too ambitious for two investigators and was abandoned. During the Winter Quarter 1977 the study was reassessed, and the objectives were simplified to determine how successful patrons were in finding books that they needed on the shelf in the Undergraduate Library.

The success of the study depended to a great extent on distributing the questionnaires to as many library patrons as possible. It had been determined from the pilot study that the rate of return was highest when the worksheets were handed out and the study was explained to each patron. A speech was prepared incorporating an explanation of the study and how it would benefit the patron. The exact speech was not recited, but the main points were included in the explanation to each patron as individual worksheets were distributed. The plea was made to return the forms, regardless of success or failure, so that the information could be used to improve library services.

Return boxes were placed at each exit turnstile so that forms could be dropped off as the patron left the library. The location of the return boxes further reduced the inconvenience to the patron. Worksheets were distributed during the morning, noon, and afternoon, regularly, by both investigators. No records of time were kept, but it was estimated that two hours was spent distributing the questionnaire daily. Library Science students who worked as student assistants were able to hand out some worksheets at night. Also, a small number of worksheets were distributed at some time on four weekends to include those users in the sample. An arbitrary figure of 500 usable returns was set as the target response, with seven weeks allowed to collect the information. The goal was reached before the time had elapsed.

The timing of the processing of worksheets was crucial to the study. Each worksheet was picked up within two to four hours of return, except those distributed at night which were picked up the following morning. The forms contained two basic types of information: 1) call number for each title the patron sought and 2) a check mark for each call number which was not located on the shelf. Each call number with a check mark was searched against the circulation file to determine if the volume was checked out, on reserve, or in some other known status. Call numbers were then checked against the shelf-list to determine how many copies of the title were supposed to be in the Undergraduate Library. Those copies that were not found in the circulation file, were then searched on the shelf to determine if patron error had been

responsible. After a 24 hour period, all copies of books not initially accounted for were rechecked both in the circulation file and on the shelf. At this point all books that had not yet been located were put in the category of books unaccounted-for.

The total number of forms distributed in a five week period was 1010 and 532 of those were returned. The number of usable forms returned was 503 or 49.8% of the 1010 that were distributed. This was probably due to the personal contact made when handing out the forms, the simplicity of completing the form, and the prominently displayed return boxes.

The following is a breakdown of the findings for those titles that were listed on the worksheets:

Number of titles searched by patron: (4.72 titles per returned form)	2375
Number of titles found on the shelf: (53.8% of titles searched were found on the shelf)	1278
Number of titles not found on the shelf: (46.2% of titles searched were not found on the shelf)	1097
Number of titles not found that were on reserve: (10.7% of the titles not found were on reserve)	117
Number of titles not found that were on the shelf: (13.9% of titles not found were actually on the shelf)	152
Total number of titles actually not available: (34.9% of titles searched were actually not available)	828

The number of titles searched on 503 worksheets was 2375 or an average of 4.72 titles per worksheet. Users found 1278 of the 2375 titles searched, available in the library. The success rate then was 53.8% which closely follows the findings of those studies discussed earlier, where the average rate of success fell somewhere in the 50 to 60% range.

The number of titles that could not be located by the user was 1097 or 46.2% of the total number searched. It is significant to note, however, that although 46.2% of the titles were not found, only 34.9% were acutally not available in the library at the time they were searched. Approximately 11% of the 1097 books that could not be located were on reserve and about 14% were actually on the shelf in their correct place. This means that user error and the inability to identify titles on reserve were responsible for nearly one quarter of the failures.

The number of titles that actually were not available somewhere in the UGL was 828. Taking into consideration those titles which had multiple copies, the total number of volumes not in the library when needed was 1025. The following is a breakdown of the reasons those books were not available.

Reason not Available	No. of copies not available	% of total not available
Checked out	423	41.1
Unaccounted-for	208	20.3
In binding	22	2.1
Lost-paid	22	2.1
In building use	17	1.7
Replacement ordered	10	1.0
Reported missing	8	0.8
On hold	7	0.7
Interlibrary loan	2	0.2

By far the most predominant reason for unavailability was that the books were in circulation. But, the next highest category of unavailable materials was the 20% that were unaccounted-for and assumed stolen or misshelved. Nine months later a follow-up search of the 208 books that were unaccounted-for revealed that 188 were still missing and 20 had reappeared on the shelves.

From the survey forms it was also possible to count the number of titles searched by LC classification. The random sample provides a general idea of the subject areas most in demand that particular quarter. Following is a breakdown of the number of titles searched by LC classification.

	Titles Searched	Percent Found
P (Language & Literature)	404	65%
H (Social Sciences)	378	47%
Q (Sciences)	246	43%
B (Philosophy, Psychology, & Religion)	194	58%
R (Medicine)	173	49%
L (Education)	169	43%
T (Engineering)	140	47%
G (Geography, Anthropology, & Recreation)	104	58%
E (U.S. History)	79	40%
N (Art & Architecture)	79	61%
Fiction	70	51%
J (Political Science)	65	54%

	Titles Searched	Percent Found
D (History & Auxiliary Sciences)	51	70%
F (Local History)	42	40%
S (Agriculture)	24	58%
K (Law)	18	73%
Z (Bibliography & Library Science)	18	83%
M (Music)	11	45%
V (Naval Science)	4	75%
U (Military Science)	2	100%

These results are valid for Spring Quarter only and may not be consistent for other quarters. Since the curriculum and assignments change from quarter to quarter, it would be necessary to survey patrons during fall, winter, and summer also, in order to get a more accurate profile of heavily used areas of the collection.

It was possible to take some action on the results of both availability studies immediately. Copies of those titles that had been categorized as unaccounted-for, were searched and declared officially missing so that replacement decisions could be made. After the first study in 1976, the UGL administration initiated an inventory of the collection so that missing books could be accounted-for and discrepancies at the shelf-list cleared-up. It was also possible, as a result of the study, to note specific titles that were in sufficient demand to warrant duplication.

What are other consequences of a study such as this? We know that our patrons will walk out of the Undergraduate Library having found on the shelf an average of 53.8% of the titles sought. We also know the reasons for this rate. Since this availability rate is comparable to those rates found in other libraries, should there be reason for concern? We think that answer is yes, since armed with our findings, steps can be taken to improve the availability.

Consider the reasons for non-availability. Almost 11% of the titles not found were on reserve. The cost would be prohibitive to mark the cards in the catalog with plastic reserve jackets. The mechanism already exists to inform patrons of the reserve materials through circulation's microfiche. Since this seems ineffective, a further step could be to produce a computer print-out of those titles charged to reserve. The list could be distributed to each floor and displayed prominently on a dictionary stand. Such lists have received heavy use at the University of North Carolina. This step could easily be initiated in any of the libraries with automated circulation systems.

A large number of titles sought were actually on the shelf, clearly a sign of patron error or lack of understanding. This problem is already being addressed by the Library system in the form of library instruction. The instruction, however, needs to provide some skills in understanding the Library of Congress classification system and the process for following up on materials that patrons can not find on the shelf. In some cases, the patron may try to determine whether a book he has overlooked is charged out. Upon not finding a charge for that title, the universal explanation given in most libraries is that the book is probably in use in the building. Our study found that to be true in only 1.7% of the cases. If the book is not charged out or on reserve, there is an excellent chance that the book is in fact on the shelf. This indicates that the search and notify process should be actively promoted by the circulation department.

It is also important for education in library use to include orientation to the library system as a whole. The community of users needs to be made well aware of the six libraries that exist on campus to serve their needs. Some of the materials that were not available in the Undergraduate Library at the time of the study may have been available elsewhere in the system. Patrons need to think of the University of Tennessee Library as a system of libraries and be aware of the steps necessary to find materials in the system.

Books in circulation accounted for the greatest number of failures at the shelf. One could interpret that this reflects a high level of success in selecting demanded titles. Such success is of little consolation to the user who arrives after the books have been charged out. In the case of the Undergraduate Library, the loan period is probably as short as would be tolerated. An alternative is the establishment of some kind of core collection with perhaps a three day loan period or for use in building only. Short loan materials would not have to be a separate collection but could be integrated with materials in the stacks. This alternative would require further study to determine its feasibility. The selection of the titles in the core would be difficult but could be aided by circulation figures and identification of titles and subject areas through additional availability studies.

The findings of this study seem to indicate a need to increase the number of volumes housed by the Undergraduate Library. A means of allowing the collection to grow would be to measure its size by title count rather than by volume count. The demand on the collection has increased while its size has remained relatively stable. There seems to be ample capacity on the shelves to accommodate an increase in the size of the collection. This study has already provided some input for development of particular LC classes and has identified some titles for duplication. Implementation of these collection development activities would require a supplement to the Undergraduate Library book budget, but this study seems to justify an increase.

Another major reason for non-availability was the large number of books which could not be accounted-for. These books may be considered misshelved or stolen, although 90% were still missing in inventory and in a follow-up search conducted nine months later. Certain LC classes with high rates of unavailability should be inventoried periodically and shelf-read regularly. The alarming number of unaccounted for copies would seem to

lend support for some kind of automated security system. If funds are not available, then as a special project, the edges of all books could be stamped to make them easily identified by turnstile attendants.

We hope that these recommendations will be taken into consideration by the library administration in an effort to better serve the library's users. We also urge that the next Director of the Undergraduate Library conduct a follow-up availability study to determine the impact of any measures which may be implemented.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Buckland, M.K. Book Availability and the Library User. New York: Pergamon Press, 1975.

Gore, Daniel, "Let Them Eat Cake While Reading Catalog Cards: An Essay on the Availability Problem," Library Journal, 100 (Jan. 15, 1975): 93-98.

Gore, Daniel. "The View from the Top of the Tower of Babel: Prospects for Academic Library Growth in the Near Future." Edited by Robert Koester. University of Tennessee Library Lectures, 1973-75. Knoxville: University of Tennessee, 1976.

Saracevic, T; Shaw, W.M. Jr.; and Kantor, P.B. "Causes and Dynamics of User Frustration in an Academic Library," College & Research Libraries, 38 (January 1977): 7-18.

Schofield, J.L; Cooper, A.; and Waters, D.H. "Evaluation of an Academic Library's Stock Effectiveness," Journal of Librarianship, 7 (July 1975): 207-227.

Trueswell, R.W. Analysis of Library User Circulation Requirements: Final Report. N.S.F. Grant GN0435, January 1968.

Urquhart, J.A. and Schofield, J.L. "Measuring Reader's Failure at the Shelf," Journal of Documentation, 27 (December 1971): 273-286.

Urquhart, J.A. and Schofield, J.L. "Measuring Readers Failure at the Shelf in Three University Libraries," Journal of Documentation, 28 (September 1972): 233-241.

November 1977

THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

Subject: User Assistance Tally

User assistance was tallied recently during a one-week (Nov. 2-8, 1977) experiment designed to assess the UGA Libraries' people impact. Because it was the first time this type of assessment had been made, some public service points were not approached to request their participation. This will be changed in future years. The detailed record of inquiries by library users was kept by: 7th floor (Fine Arts), 6th and 5th floors (Social Sciences), 4th and 3rd floors (Humanities), 2nd floor (Government Reference), 1st floor (Circulation location assistance and Reference information desk, basement (Central Periodical Room), and Science/South Branch.

A special form was developed by Reference Services as the selected record; and several public service points used their own preferred forms. This contributed to some variation in the type of detail collected. However the actual number of inquiries is representative.

This brief report summarizes some general observations made while tallying the records. The notable results are:

6840 user assistance tallies were recorded for the week. (This excludes approximately 8,800 transactions at the first floor Circulation for checking out material.)

294,120 user assistance events can be extrapolated from this figure to represent a year of library services if one accepts the formula: 43 x 6840 (where 43 represents the total number of weeks when classes are in session, and excludes the weeks when the library is in use but at a low ebb - Hence, a conservative figure.)

Some specific points of interest are:

8 questions were answered during the week between the hours of 10:30 p.m. and 12:00 p.m. at the Circulation desk. (This is of interest because of the recent change in hours of service at the Reference information desk. Professional reference service is no longer maintained until midnight; and this minimal number of inquiries during the time from 10:30 to midnight, would indicate that the change is justified.).

684 instructional type inquiries occurred during the week at the Reference information desk.

1301 directional type inquiries occured during the week at the Reference information desk.

Peak library use hours were between 1:00 p.m. and 3:00 p.m., with the two hour blocks before and after (11:00 a.m./1:00 p.m. and 3:00 p.m./5:00 p.m.) having very heavy use. Monday and Wednesday were the heaviest use days of the week, Tuesday and Thursday were also busy. Monday and Tuesday evenings showed heavy use. Variations may exist with different public service points.

6th and 7th floors show heavier user assistance than 3rd, 4th, and 5th floors. This may reflect the special circulation functions which are performed on those floors, since this tends to bring users to the floors for several purposes.

All data collection sheets and forms were left with the supervisor of each public service point. Each area can do more definitive analysis as suits particular needs. Future tallies should continue to permit some lee way in the type of data collected, since different public service points have various data requirements. The Science/South Branch results were tabulated using a computer program to run more definitive comparisons. As a recommendation for future assessments, the use of a software package to do the tedious job of calculating results for the whole project bears consideration.

A 'de-briefing' session will be called in mid-December to discuss these recommendations and others. All who are interested in making some suggestions should let me know so that the meeting can include you and your ideas.

100

DATA SUMMARY

7th floor 321 user assistance total

weekday totals - 277
- 104 tapes
- 75 directional
- 88 instructional/ready reference
- 10 search/topical (some extended searches over 30 min.)

weekend totals - 44
- 15 tapes
- 15 directional
- 14 instructional/ready reference

(many referrals to other points in the library were noted)

6th floor 329 user assistance total

weekday totals - 273
- 226 directional
- 40 instructional/ready reference
- 7 search/topical

weekend totals - 56

5th floor 96 user assistance total

weekday totals - 96 (no weekend)
- 44 directional
- 37 instructional/ready reference
- 15 search/topical

4th floor 98 user assistance total

weekday totals - 98 (no weekend)
- 75 directional
- 17 instructional/ready reference
- 6 search/topical

3rd floor 61 user assistance total

weekday total - 61 (no weekend)
- 43 directional
- 13 instructional/ready reference
- 5 search/topical

2nd floor 235 user assistance total

weekday total - 199
- 46 directional
- 96 instructional/ready reference
- 58 search/topical

weekend total - 36
- 12 directional
- 16 instructional/ready reference
- 8 search/topical

1st floor 3123 user assistance total

Circulation 202 (excludes circulation transactions estimated at 8800)
- 144 directional
- 88 referral

Information desk 2921

weekday total - 2388
- 1063 directional
- 540 instructional
- 558 ready reference
- 237 search/topical

weekend total - 535
- 238 directional
- 144 instructional
- 100 ready reference
- 41 search/topical

basement 1233 user assistance total

weekday total - 1013
- 433 directional
- 207 instructional
- 287 circulation/microform assistance
- 86 ready reference

weekend total - 220
- 108 directional
- 51 instructional
- 58 circulation/microform assistance
- 3 ready reference

(microform assistance includes getting microfiche for patrons and helping with microform equipment.)

931 directional, instructional, ready reference (185 search/topical)

91 current periodicals area (11 directional, 3 instructional, 37 ready reference)

362 circulation (261 directional, 101 referral)

Science/South Branch generated a computer response by loading the data into a standard software package (SAS) designed for this sort of data manipulation. I have a copy in the Interpretive Services Office, and copies are available at Science. Anyone interested in seeing the thorough analysis generated from this exercise should ask to see one of these copies. Attached to this report is the first page of the print-out, a summary table of the report.

SCIENCE LIBRARY REFERENCE SURVEY, NOVEMBER 2-8, 1977

DATE	FREQUENCY	CUM FREQ	PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NOV 2	206	206	22.127	22.127
NOV 3	159	365	17.078	39.205
NOV 4	100	465	10.741	49.946
NOV 5	46	511	4.941	54.887
NOV 6	54	565	5.800	60.687
NOV 7	203	768	21.805	82.492
NOV 8	163	931	17.508	100.000

TIME	FREQUENCY	CUM FREQ	PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
8-9	32	32	3.437	3.437
9-11	110	142	11.815	15.252
11-1	124	266	13.319	28.571
1-3	184	450	19.764	48.335
3-5	173	623	18.582	66.917
5-6:30	74	697	7.948	74.866
6:30-8	97	794	10.419	85.285
8-10:30	137	931	14.715	100.000

PHONE	FREQUENCY	CUM FREQ	PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NO	889	889	95.489	95.489
YES	42	931	4.511	100.000

LENGTH	FREQUENCY	CUM FREQ	PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
1-5 MINUTES	772	772	82.922	82.922
6-15 MINUTES	129	901	13.856	96.778
15-30 MINUTES	20	921	2.148	98.926
OVER 30 MINUTES	10	931	1.074	100.000

ANSWER	FREQUENCY	CUM FREQ	PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NO	19	19	2.041	2.041
YES	912	931	97.959	100.000

REFERENCE QUESTION FORM

Date _____ Time: ☐ 8-9 ☐ 9-11 ☐ 11-1 ☐ 1-3 ☐ 3-5 ☐ 5-6:30 ☐ 6:30-8 ☐ 8-10:30

Type of question: Telephone ☐

☐ Directional (location of materials, departments, etc.)
☐ Instructional (use of indexes, the card catalog, periodicals printout, etc.)
☐ Ready Reference (answered by simple searching, such as addresses, call numbers, etc.)
☐ Search/Topical (request for material on a particular subject, bibliographic search, etc.)

Time spent: ☐ 1-5 min. ☐ 6-15 min. ☐ 16-30 min. ☐ over 30 min.

Question:

Source(s) used:

Answered: Yes ☐ No ☐ Referred to: _____

Comments:

Initials of staff member _____

380/10-77/4000

MEMORANDUM

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO, BOULDER

February 1, 1974

TO: The Faculty

FROM: University Libraries

SUBJECT: Questionnaire on Branch and Divisional Libraries

This is an attempt to determine how well branch and divisional libraries respond to your needs. Your answers to this questionnaire will be used in determining future services and improvements in the University Libraries.

Thank you for your interest.

1. Position at CU

- ☐ Teaching Assistant
- ☐ Teaching Associate
- ☐ Instructor
- ☐ Assistant Professor
- ☐ Associate Professor
- ☐ Professor
- ☐ Other _____.

2. Name _____
(optional but would be good for feedback)

Telephone _____

3. My main subject area of specialization (e.g. department or research interest)
_____

4. I mainly use the following branch or divisional library(ies). (Please rank the libraries in order of use (1, 2, 3. . .) if you use more than one. Also please respond to the rest of the questionnaire re the library you use the most.)

- ☐ Art and Architecture
- ☐ Business
- ☐ Earth Science
- ☐ Education
- ☐ Engineering
- ☐ Government Documents
- ☐ Law
- ☐ Map Library
- ☐ Math/Physics
- ☐ Music
- ☐ Rare Books
- ☐ Science
- ☐ Western History

5. My frequency of library use (either personal or delegated by me to someone else) is: (Please Check one)

- ☐ More than once a week.
- ☐ More than 8 times a semester.
- ☐ Few times a semester.
- ☐ Very seldom or never.

If few times or very seldom, what in your opinion is the reason:

- ☐ My teaching doesn't require library use.
- ☐ The library is inadequate for my purposes.
- ☐ I don't like the library's physical environment.
- ☐ My research doesn't require library use.
- ☐ Other: _____

_____

6. The Library's stock of books is good for your teaching purposes:

Yes _____ No _____
Comment _____
_____

7. The Library's stock of journals is good for your teaching purposes:

Yes _____ No _____
Comment _____
_____

8. The Library's stock of books is good for your research:

Yes _____ No _____
Comment _____
_____

9. The Library's stock of journals is good for your research:

Yes _____ No _____
Comment _____
_____

10. The Library's hours are adequate.

Yes _____ No _____
Comment _____
_____

11. When I use the Library, I am given the help I need:

Yes _____ No _____
Comment _____
_____

12. How can the Library make your and your students use of it a better experience? Please rank your reaction to these statements on a scale of 6.

1. strongly agree
2. agree
3. neutral
4. disagree
5. strongly disagree
6. don't know

1 2 3 4 5 6 The Library staff is helpful.
1 2 3 4 5 6 The Library needs more staff.
1 2 3 4 5 6 Need more concern on the librarian's part with information needs of the users.
1 2 3 4 5 6 Everything is o.k. — no major improvement is needed.
1 2 3 4 5 6 Need new books and journals.
1 2 3 4 5 6 The Library needs a better physical environment (lighting, ventilation, furniture, etc.)

13. If you are not already doing so, would you consider having the branch or divisional librarian talk to your classes about information resources and their use in your specific field?

Yes _____ No _____
Comment _____
_____

14. Do you consider the bibliographic quality (e.g. coverage of the available literature, footnotes, bibliography) important when grading term papers.

Yes _____ No _____
Comment _____
_____

15. General comment on the Branch and/or Divisional Library or the University Library. (For example, it would be good to have your response to these questions: Do you feel the Library is adequately supported in its budgetary needs? How do you rank the importance of the Library in education on this campus?)

Comments:

THANK YOU.

Fold over and return please.
Via CAMPUS mail.

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO, BOULDER

TERM PAPER WORKSHOP EVALUATION

Instructions: Check as many answers as are applicable. (For example, if you heard about the Term Paper Workshop both from a professor and a poster in your dorm, check both these choices on question #1.

1. Where did you learn about the Term Paper Workshop?

_____a. posters and information in the library
_____b. posters on campus (dorms, U.M.C., etc.)
_____c. Colorado Daily
_____d. from a professor
_____e. from a librarian
_____f. from a friend
_____g. other:

Comments:

2.

3. How useful and/or relevant to your assignment did you find the Term Paper Workshop?

_____a. highly useful and relevant
_____b. informative but nor terribly relevant
_____c. it was all a rehash of information I knew
_____d. not relevant or useful at all

Comments:

4. What changes would you suggest for the Term Paper Workshops in the future? (Check as many as are appropriate)

a. Begin offering the workshops earlier _____ in the semester.
later _____
b. Offer the workshops over a longer _____ time span during
shorter _____
the semester.
c. Offer more sessions in the: morning _____
afternoon_____
evening_____

d. Increase the length of the individual sessions. _____

Comments:

5. What was you personal reaction to the Term Paper Workshop? Did you like it, dislike it, feel it was worth your time, feel that it was a waste of time? Would you recommend it to a friend or possible sign up for another session yourself? Did you think it was a good idea but needed changes? etc.

6. Did you know about the other options available to you as part of this program, such as the Term Paper "Mechanics" workshop, and individual consultation with a librarian?

_____yes _____no

Would you consider taking any of these in the future?

_____yes _____no

7. Could we contact you later in the semester either by phone or questionnaire regarding the ultimate effectiveness of the Term Paper Workshop you attended?

_____a. Yes, I'd be glad to talk about it.
_____b. No, I'd rather not spend any more time on this.

If you answered YES:

Name: _____

Local address: _____

Phone: _____

THANKS FOR ANSWERING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE!

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY LIBRARIES
DATA SERVICES

University of Kentucky
SEARCH NO. _____

LITERATURE SEARCH EVALUATION

PLEASE TAKE A FEW MINUTES TO EVALUATE DATA SERVICES. WHEN FINISHED JUST FOLD THIS IN HALF AND PUT IT IN THE CAMPUS MAIL OR RETURN IT TO THE REFERENCE DESK AT THE LIBRARY. THE ADDRESS IS PRE-PRINTED ON THE REVERSE SIDE. THANK YOU FOR HELPING US TO IMPROVE THIS SERVICE.

1. To what extent were you satisfied with the assistance provided by the search analyst?

1	2	3	4	5
Dissatisfied		Satisfied		Very satisfied

If less than satisfied indicate why _____
_____

2. To what extent are you satisfied with your bibliography?

1	2	3	4	5
Dissatisfied		Satisfied		Very satisfied

If less than satisfied indicate why _____
_____

3. How would you rate the value of the bibliography?

1	2	3	4	5
Not worth the cost		Worth the cost		Worth more than the cost

If not worth the cost explain why _____
_____

4. Which of the following was your primary reason for requesting a computerized literature search?

_____nature of the topic would have made a traditional search difficult or impossible
_____lack of time
_____need for comprehensiveness
_____other (specify)_____

5. If you have any additional comments or suggestions about the service, or the bibliography you received, please describe below.

Boston University

Mugar Memorial Library
771 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02215
617/353-3710

University Libraries

_____

To Our Search Service Users:

Now that you have the results of your search, we would appreciate it if you would take some time to help us improve our service by filling out the following questionnaire. Any information will help; do not worry if you leave a question unanswered.

I. Before the search:

1. How did you learn about the service?

2. Did the reference librarian scheduling your appointment attempt to clarify your search problem, or help you to develop it? (Circle one)

   YES NO

3. Was it possible to schedule the appointment for the hour and day you requested? (Circle one) YES NO If not, what was the problem?

II. During the search:

1. Did the librarian understand your search problem? (Circle one)

   YES NO COULDN'T TELL

2. Was the search strategy explained to you before the search was performed? (Circle one)

   YES NO

3. Did the search strategy seem reasonable? (Circle one)

   YES NO COULDN'T TELL

4. After the explanation did you understand what was going to happen? (Circle one) YES NO

5. Did the search strategy seem to work? (Circle one)

   YES NO

   If NO, was the librarian able to develop new strategies? (Circle one)

   YES NO

   Comments? _____

   _____

_____

III. The results:

1. Did you get the number of citations you expected? (Circle one)

   MORE YES LESS

2. After a quick glance, about how many of them were (estimate percentage):

   Exactly what you wanted _____

   Somewhat relevant to your research _____

   Of little or no value _____

3. Overall, the results of the search were (check one):

   Excellent _____

   Satisfactory _____

   Disappointing _____

4. Other possible services you would like to see (check please):

   Night or evening searches _____

   On-the-spot (unprepared) searches _____

   Other _____

   _____

PLEASE RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE TO THE REFERENCE DESK

Boston University
_____

When you have examined the publications identified through your search, please fill out the following section. This second questionnaire is most important to us. We would appreciate the information requested as well as any comments you may have.

1. How many of the citation retrieved did you look for?

   _____

2. Of these how many did you find at Boston University?

   _____

3. Of the number owned by Boston University but missing, how many were:

   A. Located elsewhere in the Boston area? _____

   B. Located through Interlibrary Loan? _____

   C. Never located? _____

4. Of those not owned by Boston University Libraries, how many were:

   A. Located elsewhere in the Boston area? _____

   B. Located through Interlibrary Loan? _____

   C. Never located? _____

5. Please list titles of significant books or journals you were not able to locate.

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

6. Of those items you were able to find, how many were (estimate percentage):

   A. Exactly what you wanted _____

   B. Somewhat relevant to your research _____

   C. Of little or no value _____

7. Please describe your overall impressions of the search service.

114

Please return this questionnaire to the Reference Desk

Executive Summary

A. Background

The primary research purpose of the library user study is to determine the Cornell research community's evaluation of the Cornell University libraries' (CUL) research support performance and capabilities. Toward this end a survey approach has been adopted to measure the behavior and perceptions of three populations, viz., faculty, graduate students, and professional library staff.

Survey instruments were pre-tested during June and July 1979. Questionnaires were then tailored to the three populations of interest. Actual data were collected from the three populations during the period October-December 1979.

B. Key Results

The survey results are organized along the perceptions, the library usage patterns, and hypothetical budget reallocations of the respondents.

1. Perceptions

Faculty overall evaluations of the library are neutral to moderately favorable. For most of the faculty breakdowns currency of the collection, missing volumes, reshelving, and tracing are among the lowest rated dimensions of library operations. A majority of the faculty report having used interlibrary loan, and tend to rate it as somewhat slow. There is some confusion among the faculty about how to use interlibrary loan and about what it offers.

Graduate students' overall evaluations of the library are moderately favorable. However, students rate the library lowest on the currency of the collections, missing volumes, atmosphere, and tracing. Although almost three-quarters of the students report never having used interlibrary loan, almost eighty per cent say they would seriously consider using the service.

Among all sampling groups the librarians give the most favorable overall evaluations of the library. However, of all groups, this group rates the library lowest on the missing volumes dimension. The librarians also are fairly accurate in their estimates of (lower) ratings of the library by the faculty.

2. Library Usage

The most frequently patronized branches of the library are Olin, Mann, Physical Sciences, Engineering, and Uris, in descending order. However, Mann is the most frequently cited primary branch, and Uris is the least frequently cited primary branch. Although Physical Sciences and Engineering libraries have similar patronage levels, Physical Sciences draws faculty users from a greater variety of origins.

Based on a visit per week criterion, physicial scientists, mathematicians, and the law faculty appear to be the most intensive users of the libraries. Engineering and the Social Sciences faculties are the least intensive users.

3. Budget Reallocations

Results from the budget reallocation exercises are fairly consistent across the faculty and student groups. Both of these groups generally allocate proportionately more for collection development and proportionately less for administration and computer assisted searches. There is a tendency among these two groups to fund computer assisted searches only for an increasing library budget. A striking difference between these two user groups and the librarians is evident in the librarians' tendency to adhere to the proportional allocations under the status quo for all three budget scenarios.